Verus Patroclus:

OR,

The Weapons of *Quakeriſm*, The Weakneſs of *Quakeriſm*:

BEING

A Diſcourſe, wherein the choiceſt Arguments for their chief Tenets are Enervat; and their beſt Defences Annihilat; ſeveral Abominations, not heretofore ſo directly Diſcovered, Unmasked:

WITH

A Digreſſion Explicative of the Doctrine anent the neceſſity of the Spirits Operation;

AND

An Appendix, Vindicating, *Rom*. 9. From the Depravations of an *Arminian*.

By ***William Jamiſon.***

Tit. 3. 10. *A man that is an Heretick, after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, reject.*

⁂

Edinburgh, Printed in the Year, 1689.

TO THE
Right Honourable,
The EARL of
DUNDONNALD,
Lord Cochran, &c.

AS, my Lord, amongſt the innumerable precious Benefits and Bleſſings, which God hath graciouſly vouchſafed to Mankind, or to any part thereof, His Word, Statutes and ſacred Oracles infinitly ſurpaſs, excel, and, ſo to ſpeak, obſcure all the reſt by far, more than the Sun doth eclipſe the leſſer Luminaries: ſo according to that common ſaying, *Corruptio optimi, peſſima*; Nothing by many de-

degrees is ſo miſchievous, noxious, and deadly as the Corruption and Depravation of theſe lively Oracles; For thus, tho by a curſed accident, The Wine of our Fathers Kingdom is turned into Wormwood, and that Heavenly and unpreſſed Honey into Gall; whereby the greater part of the viſible Church hath periſhed! For the Poiſon hath this moſt unhappy advantage above all others, that it is of an *hydropick nature*, making the infected, the more they have drunk, ſo much the more deſirous to drink. Hence that ſagacious Spirit, the grand

Enemy of Mankind, judged this the choiceſt expedient and mean, for reſtauration of his falling Kingdom: For to ſpeak nothing of the firſt 4000 years of the World, he hath ever, ſince the very infancy of Chriſtianity, to his outmoſt, put this in practice, always raiſing up ſuch as were moſt famous, or rather infamous, through their corrupting, abuſing, and detorting the Word of Life, and Charters of our Salvation: Of which kind, in the early days of Chriſtianity, were *Cerinthus*, *Montanus*, the *Cataphrygians*, *Samoſatenus*, *Arrius*, and a multitude beſide. But theſe firſt Eſſays, by reaſon of their palpable and direct overturning of the undoubted Fundamentals of Chriſtianity which rendred all their Sophiſtry, tho never ſo ſubtile, moſt ſuſpected, proved inefficacious to do the Buſineſs, tho in ſome reſpect, infectious enough. Therefore the Lord having by many Means, and in ſpecial, by the firſt four Councils, blown away theſe peſtiferous Miſts, and cleared up to mens minds, theſe grand *Truths* of the Holy Trinity, the Godhead of Chriſt, the Unity of his Perſon, the Diſtinction of his Na-

Natures, and the like. The Method was altered, and the following oppoſers of Truth acted by the ſame Spirit, that the former were, went more ſubtilly to work, not only forbearing to oppoſe theſe Fundamentals, but, in ſhew at leaſt, endeavouring to defend and aſſert them: By which it came to paſs, that they were more eaſily believed in all they ſaid, by the too ſimple people. In the mean while they ſecretly and ſlily ſowed their Tares under the ſpecious pretext of Unity, Order, Decency, Ornament, and antient Tradition. Under the covert of theſe & the like, was the whole Maſs of Paganiſm introduced, guilded only with the varniſhing Title of Catholick Doctrine. For thus in ſtead of the humility of a Goſpel-Miniſtry, was brought in a Prelatick Hierarchy, in imitation of the Pagan Protoflamines, which at length procreated to the World the Man of Sin, to head this degenerating Church in their Wickedneſs: And ſo they had Unity, which was worſe than Diviſion; and an Order, that became the cauſe of the moſt horrid Confuſion the World hath hitherto ſeen. Thus alſo the ſimplicity of the Goſpel was turned into Heathniſh Pageantry; and the glory of the Church of God did degenerat into a meer worldly pomp and grandour. But at length how ſad and miſerable became the caſe of the Church , when through the power of humane inventions, delivered under the name of Tradition, & the Dictats of the *Romiſh-depute* of the old Dragon, ſuch poiſonous dregs became the beſt part of the eſſentials of their Religion! Juſtification before God, aſcribed to the belief and practice thereof, and Juſtification by Faith in the

Son of God, decried and maligned! Thus were the ſame fundamental Truths, which had been more openly aſſaulted by the former Hereticks, now no leſs powerfully, but more ſubtilly almoſt overthrown. But ſo ſoon as the Lord, as it were by the dawning of a ſecond-Chriſtian-day, had diſcovered *Romes* Abominations, and rendered her hateful to all good Men; the old Artiſt & his aſſociats changed their method, tho not their deſign, impugning again more openly, theſe fundamental Truths they had aſſaulted in the early days of Chriſtianity;

But that the *W*eapon, already blunted, might yet cut, behold a new Artifice! For theſe attempts were not made, for the moſt part, by theſe who perſiſted in the company of the now deſervedly hated Church of *Rome*, but by theſe who were in appearance the Deſerters and Oppoſers thereof: Under the covert of which, they far more ſecurely infected many, who were in communion with the reformed Church, impudently aſſerting, that the chiefeſt points of Chriſtianity were Popery, on this account that the Papiſts had not expreſly denied them. Theſe were known by many names, as *Servetians*, *Anti-trinitarians*, *Socinians*, and the like. But more general was that of *Anabaptiſts*, compriſing in it ſelf all theſe, and many other ſuch Vipers. The true progeny of theſe *Anabaptiſts* are theſe, now known by the Name of *Quakers*, the men with whom I deal, who for deſign and method, are all one with the bulk of both antient and modern Hereticks. Two Artifices were alternatively uſed by the antient *H*ereticks: and by a continued ſucceſſion derived unto our preſent Adverſaries, the one of which was to abuſe the Scriptures; as if one ſhould mould a Buſhel of Jewels, into the ſhape of a Dog, Toad, or the like hateful Creature. The other, when in ſpite of all theſe ſhifts, they were Convicted out of the Scriptures, to turn upon the Scriptures themſelves, as being not free of their own Errors, nor of Divine *A*uthority. *H*ow exactly the *Quakers* write after their Copy, none acquainted with their Doctrines, ſeeth not. I hope therefore it ſhal not be unprofitable, if the following Diſcourſe ſhall unfold more particularly theſe practices of our Adverſaries, which I with a humble confidence can averr; and moreover I make ſome Diſcoveries, in particular of this more ſpiritual Myſtery of Iniquity, by none I know hitherto directly undertaken. Moreover, this my Treatiſe can be judged by none altogether ſuperfluous, who conſidereth, that the whole Land is ready to be overſpread with the *Hemlock* of *Pelagianiſm*, now known by the name of *Arminianiſm*, with which the bulk of the Prelatick Clergy is already infected, for with this *Hereſie* I have ſeveral Rancounters. But I will not trouble your Lordſhip with a further account of this my ſmall Undertaking; Yet this I crave leave to ſay, that whatever I intended of this kind, it was deſigned for your Lordſhip, not for inſtruction; for to a higher pitch, and that not without ground I preſume your Lordſhip to be arrived, but only for a teſtimony of my gratitude to your Lordſhips moſt Noble and Munificent Grand-Father, whoſe large bounty to the Learned, and Learners, did liberally extend it ſelf to me alſo, tho moſt undeſerving. Wherefore if there were any worth in this my ſmall Eſſay, your Lordſhip by right of Succeſſion may challenge a propriety therein. Neither were your Lordſhips Vertues unknown to me, while I had the honour of receiving my Education under the ſame Roof, and at the ſame time with your Lordſhip. But the ſpecial motive of my ambition to prefix your Lordſhips Name to my ſheets, is, that your Lordſhip by undoubted arguments hath proved your ſelf, to be a ſincere lover of the now much deſerted and maligned Truths of GOD, and a true favourer of his afflicted Church, trampled on theſe many years by oppreſſing Lords, that never had lawful Dominion over her: whoſe Prelatical Yoak and Hierarchy, as it hath proved the ſtair, by which, beſide many other Tyrants, the Pope hath got to the unmeaſurable height, at which he is now arrived, ſo it is ready to become the bridge, and pave the way for his Retroduction into *Britain*, with this much I thought to have troubled your Lordſhip ſeveral Months ago, but then could not, for *May* laſt, my Papers not being admitted to the Preſs without the allowance of the then publick Inſpectors, were given to Doctor *Munro*, thereunto appointed by the Prelat of *St. Andrews*, by whom I was prohibited the publication thereof, unleſs I razed out of them, all mention of Popery whatſoever. So great hath the zeal of theſe good men been againſt Popery, that ſo far as they could, they would not ſuffer it ſo much as once to be named. Yet do I not complain of any wrong done to me, but only ſhow to your Lordſhip, and the World, to how ſad a paſs things were then brought!

Go on therefore, my Lord, eſpouſing the Cauſe of the true Proteſtant Intereſt, in oppoſition to Popery, and whatſoever hath a tendency thereto: Thus ſhall your Lordſhip add the trueſt luſtre to your Nobility, by cauſing the Heart of the deſtitute, and widow Church to ſing, and bringing the bleſſing of her that was ready to periſh upon your Lordſhip. And however matters ſhall ſucceed, your Lordſhip ſhall be Feaſted with the Delicacies of a good Conſcience, in reſpect of which, the choiceſt Banquet of *Cleopatra* with her *Anthony*, are far from amounting to the courſeſt of Commons. In which, that the Lord may proſper your Lordſhip, and beſtow upon your Lordſhip and Family, his choiceſt Bleſſings, is, and ſhall be, the earneſt Prayer of, my Lord,

Your Lordſhips moſt
humble and devoted
Servant,
WILL: JAMISON.

TO

To the Judicious
READER.

THou will perhaps ſay, that this Treatiſe is but an Illade *after* Homer, *or a thirteenth* Eneid; *So much already to ſo good purpoſe being written on this Subject: I therefore hold my ſelf obliged to anſwer this Objection, by rendring thee an account of the Reaſons that moved me to this undertaking; which were, the dangerouſneſs of, though but the leaſt infection, by this deadly Diſeaſe. The Proximity, or nearneſs of the Contagion. The wonderful readineſs of its* Patrons *to broach* Books, *and Papers, bearing the Names of Anſwers of whatſoever is ſaid, or written in oppoſition to it. That Quakeriſm is moſt dangerous, and the embracing thereof, of a lamentable and dreadful Conſequence; none that ſeriouſly compare its Principles with thoſe of Chriſtianity, can be ignorant. I ſay, that compareth ſeriouſly, for others who have their Eye only,* ad verum corticem; *taking an overly view of the outſide of things, may perhaps judge this difference not ſo great, and the Conſequence of the Reception of Quakeriſm not ſo diſmal. And apprehend that the worſt things of Quakeriſm are only ſome ridiculous* Stoiciſms, *and antick Toys, which, notwithſtanding require all the want of Civility, and good manners with ſport and laughter, which thereby accreweth to the beholders. But by this their ſloth, and neglect to compare the Doctrine of this Party with the Scriptures, they render themſelves more capable to ſwallow down their poiſoned pills, and eat out of the Pot filled with nothing but death. For as* Ignoti Nulla Cupido, *as a man cannot greatly love that which he knoweth not, though it be good, ſo neither can he ſufficiently hate it, be it never ſo evil. Indeed their careleſneſs, and negligence meriteth no leſs. For certain it is, that bitter is no more contrary to ſweet, darkneſs to light, than the Doctrine of* Quakers *is to that of* Chriſt; *being no other thing but a hodge-podge of the damnable Hereſies, with which Chriſtianity hath been from its infancy aſſaulted, and wreſted, with to ſo good ſucceſs, that few, though otherwiſe moſt audacious, have ventured to Patroniſe them, under their proper names, and genuine colours; but only under a mask and vizard, and new names and titles; all which are to be found in their Doctrine mixed, and compounded together, as if the Enemy of Mankind, mindful of that common ſaying,* Ut quod non

Poſſunt, ſingula juncta valent, *had Collected in one body, all his broken and foiled Troups: having ſomewhat changed his manner of Order, and Marſhalling thereof, with which he may make the laſt one fall.*

The truth of this could eaſily be evinced, were this a place convenient, and the Sequel will afford many inſtances, by which the Reader may judge of the reſt. Moreover, *ſuppoſing that* Quakeriſm *were far leſs noxious than it is, ſeing in every corner of the Land, there be many of its Defenders ſwarming among all people, it cannot be judged unneceſſary to give an Antidot againſt it, more than to write Rules againſt any infectious Diſeaſe, raging in a Land. Even although many things of this kind were already extant; eſpecially ſeing theſe Papers, with which I preſent thee, are both without Prolixity, and alſo diſcover ſome things of great concernment, which, for any thing I know, were never ſo fully, or directly handled by any others, which, I hope, may in part juſtifie my undertaking. But the thing moſt moving me to trouble the world with any Treatiſe of this kind, was, that no ſooner did any Piece in oppoſition to* Quakeriſm, *ſee the light, but preſently there came forth another, bearing the name of a* Refutation thereof. *At this I did not a litle wonder; for after a moſt impartial, and ſerious weighing of their Principles, in the ballance of the Sanctuary, I found them (to ſay no more) directly oppoſite to the holy Scriptures. I therefore, with all ſeriouſneſs, peruſed ſeverals of the moſt elaboured Pieces, which had not been as yet anſwered; comparing them with theſe, againſt whom they wrote. After all which, my thoughts were quite altered; for I left off to admire their promptitude of anſwering, and fell to wonder at their impudence, ſeing in every point, they in ſtead of Confuting, Confirm what their Adverſaries ſay againſt them. In ſhort, all the beſt of their anſwers, are either a quite omiſſion, and paſſing by the ſubſtance of what is brought for the overthrow of their* Doctrine, *or at beſt meer ſhifts, or elſe a moſt audacious aſſerting of theſe things* In Terminis, *which are ſufficient in the eſtimat of all Chriſtians, to render the Maintainers thereof more abominable than worſt of Pagans, though they were but only inferred by a long threed of conſequences, which the* Eternity *of Chriſts Manhood, and the Souls being a part of God, no leſs loudlie than impiouſlie aſſerted by them, ſufficiently witneſs. Theſe, I ſay, they either directly maintain, even in their laſt peices, or elſe can never be brought to diſown them. Of which dealing, the Sequel*

quel will give diverſe undeniable inſtances, which indeed is the main Scope of this diſcourſe. Among theſe Authors, I beſtowed moſt thoughts upon Robert Barclay *His* Vindication *of his* Apology, *which I found made up of untruths, perverſions, falſe ſuppoſitions. As for example, to Vindicat and urge moſt of the places of Scripture brought in* His Apologie; *as the foundation of his Doctrine, he ſuppoſeth that from the ſame texts his Adverſarie inferred our contrary doctrine, and thinketh it ſufficient to deſire his Adverſary to prove our Doctrine from theſe places. Theſe are the proper Elements of this Compoſition, but to make up a fourth, he knowing that by all men the Quakers were accuſed of matchleſs rayling, taketh the Start, and filleth no ſmall part of his book, accuſing His Adverſarie, as an unparalelled railer: The ground of which accuſation is, that his adverſarie, as occaſion ſerveth, telleth his Reader, that the Quakers, and this Apologiſt, among the reſt, were no leſs groſſe and abominable than* Arrians, Socinians, Pelagians, Papiſts, Libertins, Anabaptiſts, *and the like. His Symbolizing with which he adventureth not to deny: Which although at other times he doth, yet groundleſlie, as theſe Papers will in part, and more fullie, an entire Colation of Quakeriſm with the Principles of theſe Sects, will demonſtrate to any, who hath but the leaſt Spunk of ingenuity, and Candour. I forbear to ſay, although I could, that our Vindicator is no novice in the very Crime, of which he ſo oft accuſeth his adverſarie. However the matter be, he might have forborn his accuſations of that which he knew his Brethren, to be of all Men moſt guilty, which, not to mention others,* Burroughs *anſwer to* Bennets *queries, and* Hubberthorns *reply to* Sherlok, *evidently witneſs,* Quis tulerit Grachos de ſeditione querentes. *The like I ſay of* Geo: Keith *in his book, intituled, Truth defended (evil enough, I am ſure) For in it he never ſpeaketh to the purpoſe, or toucheth what His Adverſarie Mr.* John Alexander *had ſaid, or elſe marreth in ſtead of mending the matter; for others, I forbear to ſpeak of them, theſe mentioned being the moſt learned of their Authors. Neither can I expect any better dealing, than theſe and the like have met with, and altho they, as ſome of them have begun to do already, upbraid me with the infirmity in which divine Providence hath ſtated me, they will inſtead of doing their buſineſs hereby, only ſhew to the World, that they have been too docil of a bad Leſſon, taught them by the Phariſees long ago.* John. 9. *Neither do I intend at preſent to trouble*

my

myſelf and others, with whatſoever they ſhall give under the name of an anſwer, ſeing the badneſs of their cauſe will not permit them to give any better, than what they have given to others: In which, they have been ſo unhappie, that one would have thought, that they of purpoſe verified that ſaying of the Poet, Cauſa patrocinio non bona major erit. *And although they ſay, that this is only but a ſhift to ſave me the labour of a reply.* I *value it not, but appeal to all the Reformers. Confeſſions of* Faith, *yea and all the Reformed Churches, as ſufficient umpires in the caſe. Yea and in many points to all Chriſtians of whatſoever profeſſion, except the* Socinians, *who retain nothing of Chriſtian Doctrine, but only arrogat to themſelves the name. Neither let them ſay with* Rob: *Bar:* Vind: Sect: *6, That our Doctrine is contrary to that of ſome of the reformed Churches, in moſt weightie points, as for example* Election, *and* Reprobation *and the like; becauſe in theſe we oppoſe the Modern* Lutherians, *ſeing (as* Wendelin *in his* Exercitations, *and in ſpecial* Exerc. 16, 17, 18. *Hath fully evicted) the Modern* Lutherians *are altogether oppoſit in theſe points to the ancient* Lutherans, *ſuch as* Herbrandus, Heſnuſius, Brentius, *and moſt of all* Luther *Himſelf: And therefore are ſo far as touching theſe points, from deſerving the name of Reformed, that they ought to be accounted their capital adverſaries. But not to prefix a long preamble to a ſhort diſcourſe: In a word,* I *ſay, that as the Doctrine of* Quakers *is a heap of Non ſuch Blaſphemies; ſo their defences are* mera χρυςφυγετα, *Subterfuges ſo naked and ſillie, that one would admire, how any rational man could ſatisfie himſelf with them, but*

Qui bibit inde, furit, procul hinc diſcedite, queis eſt
Cura bonæ mentis, qui bibit inde, furit.

He ſtraight runs mad who drinks hereof,
Flee hence, who ever had
A Love unto your precious Souls,
who drinks hereof runs mad.

Touch not, taſte not, handle not the unclean things. For which end I preſent thee with theſe Sheets, of which that thou may reap profit, and advantage to thy Immortal Soul, ſtanding in hazard from the infection of the Mortal diſeaſe of Quakeriſm, is, and ſhall be the earneſt Prayer of thy Servant, to ſerve thee in the Lord.

William Jamiſon.

CHAP. I.

Of the Holy Scriptures.

A *GOOD Name is better than precious ointment*, ſaith the Preacher, *Eccl.* 7.1. Whoſoever therefore intend to bring either Perſons, or Things under Diſeſteem and Contempt, labour in the firſt place to Spoil them of any *Good Name*, or due *Titles* belonging unto them, to the end, They may the more eaſily Effectuate their *Purpoſe*; This Method the *Quakers* have thought very fit and appoſit, whereby to diſcredit, and finally to overthrow the *Holy Scriptures*. For in the firſt place, they endeavour to rob them of the chiefeſt *Titles*, and moſt famous *Elogies*, with which the *Holy Ghoſt* hath adorned them: among which, that of being called the *Word of God*, is not the leaſt. An Inſtance of this may be *James Nailor*, who in his Anſwer to the *Jews*, *pag.* 12. Saith, *It's the Devil that contends for the Scriptures to be the Word of God.* Others of Them ſay, *They are not the Word of God, but the Words of Men that ſpake them freely*: Yea generally, All the *Quakers* unanimouſly deny, that the *Scriptures* are, or ought to be called the *Word of God*: But in ſo doing, they flately contradict *God* ſpeaking in the *Scriptures*; For there they are moſt frequently called the *Word of God*, As *Num.* 3. 16. *Deut.* 5. 5. 1. *King.* 12. 24. *Jer.* 1. 2. and 6. 10. and 20. 8. *Hoſ.* 1. 2. *Amos.* 8. 12, *Zeph.* 2. 5. *Luke.* 22. 61. 1. *Sam.* 9. 27. *Mark.* 7. 13. compared with 10. Theſe Scriptures, and many others that might be Cited, unanſwerably prove that the Scriptures are, and ought to be called the *Word of God.* Several of theſe Paſſages with many others calling the *Scriptures*, or a part thereof the *Word of God* or of *the Lord* in the ſingular number, are adduced by *Mr Brown* Chap. 4. N. 2. To all which *Robert Barclay*'s reply *Vind*: pag. 31, is a flat contradiction of theſe Scriptures, ſaying, *That the thing which the Prophets ſpake, was only the words which came from the Word of God.* Judge therefore, Reader, if ſuch replies as theſe can either help the Author, or hurt his adverſaries.

Notwithſtanding theſe Men have ſomething to ſay for themſelves, and ſo had they who denyed the fire to be hot, or the ſnow white.

Their firſt Reaſon, why the Scriptures are not the *Word of God*, is, Becauſe Chriſt is called the *Word of God*: but this reaſon ſayeth nothing, but upon ſuppoſition that one word, or phraſe cannot undergo divers acceptations, which is moſt falſe, yet *Robert Barclay* in the Vindication of his Apology *Pag.* 31. to ſtrengthen this Reaſon, ſayeth, that *one epithete* (or attribute) *cannot be predicated,* (or affirmed) *of two things* κατ' ἐξοχὴν (or by way of eminence) *without a groſſe contradiction*

diction: But in this he only bewrayes his own ignorance of the Laws of a Contradiction, and his deſire of contradicting the Scriptures with a ſhew of Reaſon: For whether by *the Word of God*, Chriſt or the Scriptures are to be underſtood this *Elogie* is ſtill aſcribed to either of them, with a peculiar eminency; But by the diverſity of the acceptation the Contradiction is removed, which diverſity may be eaſily Perceived by any that read or hear the Scriptures, or other Diſcourſes, in which mention is made of *the Word of God*: As for Example, who could read theſe two Texts of Scripture, *Mark*. 7. 13. and *Rev*. 19. 13. but they would preſently ſee, that in the latter of the Texts, by *the Word of God*, *Chriſt* is to be underſtood, and in the former, *the Scriptures*? except he were altogether ſtupid, and ſo there is not the leaſt appearance of a Contradiction. Therefore in ſhort, where by *the Word*, Chriſt is underſtood, τὸ *Word* is taken improperly, *viz*. For a Perſon, the eſſential and ſubſtantial Word of God, in ſo much as Chriſt is the Principal Declarer of the Mind of God, or upon other ſuch accounts, ſuch improper Attributes being frequently aſcribed to Chriſt, as a *Door*, a *Vine*, and the like. But on the other hand, where by *the Word of God*, we are to underſtand the Scriptures, there τὸ *Word* is taken in a more proper acceptation, for a diſcourſe compoſed of Letters and Syllables.

The ſame Author hath yet another Reaſon, *and* it is a rare one, *viz*. *That there are moe words in the Scriptures than one, Therefore they cannot be* *called* the Word of God. Behold, Reader, with what ridiculous Shifts, theſe men endeavour to uphold their impiety, and oppoſe themſelves to God! Who but he that deſired the Fools Coat, would thus reaſon? It is a lie to name an Epiſtle ſent from one Perſon to another, a *Letter*, becauſe in it there are moe Letters than one. Not only the Jews who were Chriſts Enemies, but even the Apoſtles themſelves, had done right in the judgment of this Quaker, if when *Chriſt*, *Mark* 7. 13, called the Scriptures the *Word of God*, they had flatly contradicted him, and ſaid, this is a lye, ſeing there are moe Words in the *Scriptures* than one. Here is ridiculous folly and impious *Blaſphemy* mixed together. And yet worſe, (if worſe can be) unavoidably followeth this their Doctrine, even that the *Son* of *God* was not from Eternity, For according to them, when it is ſaid, Hoſ. 1. 2. *The Beginning of the Word of the Lord*, the meaning muſt be, the beginning of Chriſt.

With the like ſacrilegious audacity they endeavour to bereave the Scriptures of that ſweet and heart-melting *Title* of *the Goſpel*, ſaying, *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke* and *John*, *are not the Goſpel, but the Letter*. The Defence of this wicked and bold Contradiction of the Scriptures, *William Pen* undertaketh in his *Rejoinder* to *John Faldo*, *Pag.* 117. His Reaſons, whereby he would prove it, are, 1. Becauſe the Goſpel is called *the Power of God to Salvation*, ſo are not the Scriptures. To which I anſwer, That the Scriptures may as well be called *the Power of God to Salvation*, as the *Goſ-*

pel, ſeeing it was the ſame *Doctrine* which the *Apoſtles* both preached to the People, and committed to Writing: And the *Righteouſneſs of God is revealed from Faith to Faith* by this Doctrine, when it is committed to writing, as well as when it was Preached by the Apoſtles. 2. By *the Power of God to Salvation*, no other thing can be underſtood but the Mean, Organ, or Inſtrument, whereby God exerteth, or putteth forth his Power to the ſaving of Sinners: Which kind of Metonymie is frequent in Scripture.

The next Reaſon to prove that theſe Books ought not to be called the *Goſpel*, which the Mans copious invention brancheth into two, is, *That the Goſpel is everlaſting, and was Preached before the Scriptures were*, therefore they are not the Goſpel. *Anſ.* 1. The Principles of Truth are everlaſting, and were before any Quakers Books were extant, Therefore a *Pamphlet*, which the Quakers have entituled, *The Principles of Truth* carrieth as a token of what is within, a lie in the Frontiſpiece thereof, which I believe *William Pen* will hardly admit. *Anſ.* 2. The Doctrine contained in thoſe Books is the ſame with, and therefore no leſſe everlaſting than the Goſpel proclaimed by the Angel, *Rev.* 14. 6. cited by *Pen*.

His two laſt Reaſons whereby he would prove thoſe Books not to be the Goſpel, are, that *the Goſpel is but one*; and that it is *glad Tidings, but the Books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are four, and but Narratives, and not glad Tidings*, are of the like nature with the former: For he knoweth well enough that *Matthew, Mark, Luke* and *John* deliver not a contrair Doctrine one to another, but only divers Narratives of the ſame Doctrine; All which Books contain the glad Tidings of the Birth, Life, Death, and Reſurrection of our *Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, the *Saviour* of the World: And this I aſſert in oppoſition to this Quaker, who here diſcovereth himſelf in his own Colours, in that he denyeth that the Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke* and *John* contain glad Tidings; what could the *Devil* himſelf utter more black and Helliſh than this? Behold, Reader, with what ridiculous Sophiſtry theſe men can cheat their own Souls, which is ſo blunt, that a ſchool-boy would be aſhamed to bring it forth, and what black, and Helliſh Impieties they not only ſwallow down themſelves, but with open face avouch before the world. Laſtly, if theſe Books, as for example, *Mark* ought not to be called the *Goſpel*, and by the *Goſpel* ought alwayes to be underſtood the *power of God*, or *the eſſential Attribute of Gods* Power (for thus they with abominable *ſuenchfeldius* underſtand Rom. 1. 16.) then the meaning of *Mark*, 1. 1. muſt be *the Beginning of the* Power *of God, of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God*; which place, if it have any Senſe thus underſtood, muſt have a black one, *viz.* That *the* Power *of God.* i. e. God Himſelf was not before *Mark* wrote his Book, or elſe, that the firſt Verſe is a lie; let them chuſe which of them they will admit.

2. But with no leſs Earneſtneſs, and Induſtri do theſe men labour to clothe the *Scriptures* with baſe Epithets, and contemptible Aſperſions, than

to bereave them of the honourable Titles, and Divine Encomies, of which God their Author hath thought them worthy; not unlike the *Heathens*, who the better to induce Lions and other Wild-beaſts to devour the *Chriſtians*, ſewed them in Skins of other Beaſts, hated by theſe to whoſe Fury they expoſed them; This Charge I make out by theſe following Expreſſions of the *Quakers*; for they ordinarly call the *Scriptures* the *Letter*, and by way of Diſparagement, *Writings*, as the *Queries* given to Mr. *John Alexander* witneſſe, *ſuch a Letter, about the meaning of which not two are agreed*; Robert *Barclay's Apolog.* cap. 2. *Ink* and *Paper*, Cited by Mr. *Hicks* in his Dialogues, Pag, 41: And that, *It is Idolatry to call the Scripture, a Means*; *George White-head*, in his *D. P.* pag. 13. and account them no better than an old *Almanack*, witneſs *Hollbrow*, cited by *Hicks*, pag, 20. And that *it is dangerous for People to read them*, *Fox*, and *Hubberthorn*, in *Truths Defence*, pag. 101. *And that Faith grounded on the Scriptures, is but an empty and implicite Faith, and beſpeaks ſuch Perſons void of the knowledge of God, Chriſt, and to be yet in their ſins, And that ſuch Men walk in their own Fancies and Imaginations*, Chriſt aſcended, pag. 11. and that *that which is ſpoken from the Spirit of Truth, in any* (to wit) of the Quakers : *Is of as great Authority as the Scriptures, yea greater*, George White-head, *in his Apolog. pag.* 49. *And he that perſwades the People, to let the Scriptures be a Rule of Faith, and Practice would keep the People* *in darkneſs, for whoever walketh by the Rule without them, & teach men ſo to do, would make void the* Covenant *of Life and Peace;* Edward Burrows, *pag.* 62. *And that is no Command to me, which is a Command to another. Neither did any of the Saints act by a Command that was given to another.* Edward Burrows, *pag.* 47. And again he ſays, *ſuch as go to* Duty *in imitation of the Letter, which was a Command to others, their* Sacrifice *is an abomination to the* Lord. And Pag. 105. *That they that take up a Command from the* Scriptures, *are in the Witchcraft.* And that *if the Bible were burnt, as good an one might be writ,* Sayes one *Nicolas Lucas,* cited by *Mr. Hicks, Dialog.* 2. Pag. 5. *and evinced by him againſt Pen,* Dialog. 3. pag. 86. Moreover, *William Pen* in his *Rejoinder,* to *John Faldo, pag,* 70. Saith, *but we have good Reaſon to deny them to be the Rule of Faith, and Judge of* Controverſies, *which can neither give nor govern Faith, nor judge of* Controverſies, and again *pag.* 73. *In ſhort, The* Scriptures *are not the Rule, but a Declaration of Faith and* Knowledge. And *Chap.* 3. *pag.* 35. He endeavoureth what he can to render the Scriptures altogether uncertain, Saying, *I cannot but obſerve after what a ſuſpected rate the* Scriptures *have been both firſt Collected, and then conveyed through the ſeveral ſucceeding Ages.* And again, *Are we ſure that the Judgment of thoſe who Collected them, was ſufficient to determin what was* Right, *and what not? For that which gives Scripture its Canon, is not plurality of Voices, but that Word of God, which gave it forth;*

If that Divine Counſellour preceeded not, what aſſurance have our Anti-revelation-adverſaries of their Doctors Choice, and granting, that they have not rejected any Writing given forth by the Holy Ghoſt (which is a great Queſtion) and that which they have given us, was in the main Writ by his Inſpiration (which I believe) Yet how we ſhall be aſſured that in above 300 years, ſo many hundred Copies as were doubtleſs taken, ſhould be Pure, and Uncorrupted, Conſidering the private Diſſenſions, the readineſs of each Party to bend things to their own Belief, with the growing and ſucceeding Faults of leaving out, adding, tranſpoſing, &c. which Tranſcribers might be guilty of, perhaps more through Careleſſneſs than Deſign, is beyond John Faldo's Skil upon his principles to inform us. From hence we may obſerve the uncertainty of John Faldo's Word of God, *who by Authorities can never prove the Scriptures to be given forth by Inſpiration, nor that they are truly collected, neither could theſe* Perſons, *who firſt made them Canonical, be aſſured of the exactneſs of thoſe copies, they then found Extant; Nor was the Collectors Judgment infallible, And to come nearer to our Times, Learned Men tell us of little leſs than 3000 ſeveral Readings in the Scriptures of the New Teſtament in Greek.* Thus ye ſee he laboureth with all his Pith, to overthrow the extrinſical Arguments, whereby the Divinity of the Scriptures is proved: And on the other wing of this Ethnick Army, *Robert Barclay* Aſſaulteth the intrinſick Arguments, and Divine *Characters*, imprinted on the Scriptures; ſaying in his Apolog. Chap. 2. *That they do not think that the Authority of the Scriptures, doth depend on any Efficacy, or Virtue placed in theſe Writings.* and in his Vindication (I had almoſt ſaid Abridgment of his Apology) he denyeth, *That there is any ſtamp of Divine Authority upon the Scriptures;* and impiouſly aſcribeth the ſame *to ſome other Spirit, ſeparate from, and beſides the Scriptures,* which cannot be the *Spirit* of *God,* Seeing he himſelf aſſerteth elſewhere, *That this Spirit is in all men,* and the Scriprure ſaith, *That ſome men have not the Spirit of God.* But ſhall not the Scriptures, which were dictate by the living God carry ſomething of the Stile of the Author? Shall the writings of *Livy, Virgil, or Cicero,* carry ſuch Evidences that they were theirs? So that a *Humaniſt* may diſtinguiſh the True from the Counterfit, although he had never heard theſe men immediatly relate, Sing, or Declaim; Surely this will be denyed of none but a Quaker: Shall then God himſelf be outſtripped and overcome by theſe Writers? The Scriptures then according to the *Quakers* have no Majeſty of Stile, no harmony of Parts, no Scope of the whole &c. Nor any ſuch Notes, whereby they may declare themſelves to be the Dictates of the Living *God.* Hence we may ſee, That theſe men are fitter Companions for *Porphyrie* and *Celſus,* the two Heathniſh *Champions,* than for a Chriſtian, ſeeing they bend all their Wit and Skil to revive again *Heathniſme* under the name of *Quakeriſme.* I ſhall only add for confirmation of my Aſſertion the Words of *Benjamin Furly* a Quaker in *Rotterdam*, cited by Mr. *Hicks*, in his *Quakers appeal anſwered, pag.* 16. *There is nothing* (Sayes he) *in the Scripture that is a Duty upon me, or which I am obliged to Obey, becauſe there recorded; Whatſoever is a Command to me, I muſt not receive from any man, or thing without me, nay, not the* Scripture *it ſelf; yea it is the greateſt* Error, *in the world that ever was invented, and the ground of all* Error, *to Affirm that the Scriptures ought to be a Rule to Chriſtians.*

3. By this time I have abundantly juſtified my Charge, having ſet down already ſo much of this blaſphemous Doctrine, as I am confident, hath filled my Reader with Horrour and Indignation, if he retain but the leaſt ſpark of *Chriſtianity*, or love to the *Holy Scriptures.* And O that while we conſider theſe Abominations, we could mourn and tremble in Contemplation of our heavy Tranſgreſſions, that have provocked the Holy God in his juſt Judgment, to let looſe and permit theſe ſatanical Spirits to rage abroad, and pollute the very Air with their poyſonous Breath, and peſtiferous Blaſphemy! This laſt paſſage I ſhould not have ſet down, were it not that *Robert Barclay*, in his *Vindication of his Apology*, of the many ſcores of paſſages, quoted out of the *Quakers* own Books by *Mr. Brown*, to prove the blaſphemouſneſs, and abſurdity of their Doctrine, in the Defence of this only, adventureth to ſay ſomewhat, I ſhal therefore ſet down what he ſayeth, and refute the ſame: His words are. *Vind.* Pag. 37. *But what he urgeth of this further.* Pag 57. *and* 59.

from the ſaying of ſome Quakers, affirming that it's not a Command to them which is given to another, albeit I might juſtly reject it, as impertinent till he prove it, for the Reaſons above Declared upon this occaſion; yet becauſe he mentions Benjamin Furley *in* Rotterdam, *having ſome Knowledge of that Matter, I anſwer, whether will he ſay, All the Commands in Scripture to every Perſon therein mentioned, are binding upon every individual* now. *If he dare not, ſay they are, as I know he dare not, how muſt I then diſtinguiſh betwixt what binds me, and what binds me not? muſt it not be by the Spirit,* (ſuppoſe it were only ſubjectively, as he will confeſs) *enlightening the underſtanding to make the Diſtinction: Then it ſeems it is the operation of the Spirit that makes them know their Duty, and ſure they cannot obey before they know.* But if he ſay, *that tho they ſhould want that operation of the Spirit, and did not know nor acknowledge them to be their Duty, yet that they are binding upon them, neither* Benjamin Furley, *nor any Quaker will deny. But even the Commands of Gods Spirit, and the Precepts of the Scripture, which now concern all, are binding upon all, ſo that they ſhal be juſtly condemned for not obeying, albeit by the perverſneſs of their hearts and Wills, they either refuſe to obey, or will not acknowledge them; ſo that his urging of that* Pag. 60. and 61. *And his pleading for it, is unneceſſary, and needs no Anſwer; yet who could ſay, they could obey to any advantage of their ſouls, without this operation of the Spirit, ſince whatſoever is not of*

Faith is ſin? But as to theſe words ſaid to be written by Benjamin Furley, *he is challenged to prove they are his without adding, or diminiſhing (and it is very well known, the adding or diminiſhing of two or three words in a few lines will quite alter the Senſe) and before he has anſwered this Challenge, and freed himſelf from the juſt Cenſure of a Callumniator, albeit he take the help of his Author* Hicks, *he will find his folly in accuſing men at ſecond hand proofs, and upon the Teſtimony of their Adverſaries.* Thus he. All the Reaſons he gave above, why he ought not to vindicate the blaſphemous Paſſages cited out of ſeveral *Quakers* were, becauſe theſe Paſſages were cited by theſe that are adverſaries to Quakers, ſuch as *Hicks*, *Stalham*, and the like, who ſtill cite Book and Page of the Quakers, where they are to be found, ſo truly, that this Vindicator hath not one inſtance to give where they have dealt unfaithfully; Hence this Reaſon according to him proveth his Vindication unworthy of an anſwer, ſeing the citation of Paſſages is enough to Vindicate theſe Authors from an unjuſt charge. Therefore let it be obſerved, that the whole multitude of Paſſages which are fraughted with Blaſphemies and Abſurdities, even to the begetting of an utter deteſtation at the Principles of this party, in the hearts of all the Lovers of the Holy Scriptures, which are cited by Mr. *Brown*, remain without any Vindication, or Mollification, except that which rendereth the Author of this Vindication ridiculous, and the Principles of his party more abominable. But let us come to the Matter of *Furley*, of which he ſayes, he has ſome Knowledge, we may therefore expect a ſufficient Reſolution about it (as for other paſſages of this Nature, he inſinuateth a profound ignorance concerning them) wherefore he meriteth a ſharp Cenſure from his *Brethren*, for undertaking that of which he was altogether ignorant, and they the note of folly, for the permiſſion of the publication of the ſame, for in Reaſon we ought to ſuppoſe that they reviſed it. In the firſt place, The *Dilemma* wherewith he endeavoureth the Protection of his Brother, is altogether impertinent, and helpeth him not a whit, for ſeing he inſinuateth, that there are no ſubjective Revelations, and elſewhere clearly denyeth, that there are any, this *Dilemma* if it can do any thing, it will only be *Argumentum ad hominem*: And ſo according to the Quakers, men ſhal not be bound to obey any of the Commands of God: As for Example, to abſtain from Murder except the Lord by an immediat objective Revelation, ſuch as he gave to *Moſes* or the reſt of the *Prophets*, enjoined this unto them. Behold, Reader, the dangerous Concluſion! The abominableneſſe of which maketh this Vindicator uſe many Shifts, and Tergiverſations to varniſh the ſame, notwithſtanding of which it inevitably recurreth, and ſticketh faſt unto him. 2. Neither doth this *Dilemma* involve his Adverſary, or any of the Reformed in any thing like the abſurd *Doctrine* of the *Quakers*, for although the ſubjective illumination of the Spirit be very neceſſary for the true Underſtanding of the Scriptures,

tures, yea and of abſolute neceſſity for ſuch a knowledge of them, whereby we know God revealed in them, ſo that we have true Love and Fear, and Faith in him as the Effects, and Concomitants of this knowledge; yet he that ſhall deny, that any Reader of the *Scriptures*, tho endued with ſound Reaſon, only can diſtinguiſh between Commands given to a particular People, for a certain time, ſuch as *to offer Sacrifice*, or to *abſtain from Swines-fleſh*, and theſe who bind at all times, as for example, *Not to prophane the Name of God*, or to *honour Parents*, muſt have abandoned the exerciſe of *Reaſon*. 3. While he alledgeth, That neither *Benjamin Furley*, or any other Quaker will deny, *that Scripture Precepts, which concern all are binding upon all*, he openly contradicteth *Furley*, who denyeth, *that he ought to receive any Command, from any man, or thing without him, yea or from the Scriptures themſelves*; *And further denyeth without any limitation*, that the Scriptures ought to be called a Rule. And all this, tho moſt blaſphemouſly and abſurdly, yet moſt conſonantly to the *Quakers Principles*: Our Vindicator, in ſtead of doing Service to his Party, notably prevaricateth their Cauſe, not ſticking to give away their great *Principles*, while other ſhifts for defence thereof fail him. 4 What he addeth, *without the operation of the Spirit men cannot obey to the good of their own Souls*, is altogether impertinent, as if one ſhould in anſwer to a Man enquiring, *what Duties he ought to perform to ſuch a Superiour*, tell him, what for the time he was in caſe to perform, ſo as to reap any Advantage thereby, which would be, as the Proverb goes, *falcem pro ligone dare*. 5. He quietly ſlideth over, without ſo much as naming theſe words of *Furley*, (*viz.*) *yea it is the greateſt error of the World, that ever was invented, and the Ground of all error, to affirm, that the Scriptures ought to be a Rule to Chriſtians*: which Doctrine, as it rendereth any Lover of *God*, and his *Word* ſecure from being tainted with *Quakeriſme*, ſo that the palpableneſs of the Blaſphemy is an *Antidote* to the Poiſon; in like manner, it hath rendered our Vindicator ſpeechleſs, denuding him of his Shifts of *Primary and Secondary Rule*, under the Protection of which diſtinction the Quakers would fain ſhroud themſelves: For in theſe words of *Furley* there is no mention of a *Primary*, *or Secondary Rule*, which without doubt *Furley* had made, if he had believed the Scripture to be a ſecondary Rule, ſeing certainly he was not ignorant that the *Quakers* were branded, with the name of being Enemies to *Scripture*. 6. In the laſt place our Vindicator declareth, that *all he hath hitherto ſaid*, in Defence of *Furley*, was, but the patrociny of a very bad and indefendible Cauſe, in that he would faſten upon his Adverſary, the Falſification of *Furleys* Words: For if they were falſified, why attempted he to defend them as they were, while the ſenſe was quite altered and perverted, as he inſinuateth; Moreover, if thoſe words of *Furley* were falſified, he was bound to have vindicated, and delivered them, as they were written by *Furley*,

ley, which doubtleſſe he was in caſe to do, if there had been any ſuch thing; ſeing he profeſſeth that he hath Knowledge of the Matter, which he doth not profeſſe concerning any Quaker, mentioned in his Adverſaries Book: Hence it is evident that his Adverſary is not at all guilty of the ignominious Epithets of *Fool* and *Calumniator*, but whether or not they light upon the Author, I leave it unto men of Judgment to conſider.

4. From what is ſaid, it is moſt evident, that the *Scriptures* according to the Judgment of *Quakers* are in no ſenſe, to be counted a Rule, and lay no obligation upon any to believe, and walk according to them. Hence *William Pen* ſayeth, *that the Spirit of God, who is God, is the alone Rule of a Spiritual Chriſtian*; (viz.) of *Faith* and *Life*; for of that he is handling *Rejoin.* Pag. 76. And this the moſt of their Arguments, if they prove any thing, intend. As for Example, that common Topick of the Quakers (viz.) *That which Was the Rule of the Patriarchs Faith, before the Scriptures were written, is the Rule of ours now*: But I ſubſume that the Scriptures of the old, and New Teſtament were in no reſpect the Rule of the Patriarchs Faith. *Ergo* according to the Quakers, the Scriptures in no reſpect can be called the Rule of Faith and Manners: but finding that the groſsneſſe of this Doctrine bewrayeth it ſelf, and too palpably unmasketh its abettors, they have invented ſeveral diſtinctions, under the Covert of which they might ſhroud themſelves, and elude all the Arguments whereby the Scriptures are

proved to be the Rule of Faith and Manners : As that *the Scriptures are the Verbal and Hiſticorical* Rule *of Faith, which is the Devils Faith, but not of ſaving Faith*: Thus ſpeaketh *William* Pen *Rejoin.* Pag. 71. But that wherein they place their *Sacred Anchor*, or main ſtrength is that of *Adequate* and Pr*imary, inadequate or ſecondary Rule*, aſſerting that *the Scriptures are not the adequate or compleat, and* Principal *Rule of Faith and Manners, but only an inadequate, in-compleat and ſecondary Rule*, That is, that the Scriptures contain not all that we are bound to believe, or do, and that we ought to believe or practiſe nothing, tho never ſo clearly holden forth, or commanded in the Scriptures, as for example, *that God ſent his Son into the World*, or that we ought to love God or our Neighbour, *except by a miraculous Revelation from Heaven*, (as *Hubberthorn* in his *R*eply to *Sherlock* ſpeaketh) we be told the ſame thing over again: By which Revelation we ought, ſay they, to examine the Scriptures: And becauſe we deny this Doctrine, and abhorre it as the Flood-gate of all errors, They cry out, that *we are carnal, Enemies to the Spirit, void of Light*; upon this ground alſo, the Miniſters that make the Scriptures the Rule of their Doctrine they call by the Names of *Baals* Prie*ſts* , *Thieves* , *Devils*, *Enemies of God*, with a thouſand of the like denominations, wherefore that the State of the Controverſy may appear, and our Adverſaries be deprived of their lurking places, I premit this aſſertion, in order to the production of true and ſaving Faith two Principles are required, Firſt, The Declaration of the Object, or thing to be believed or practiſed, which is commonly called in the Schools *Objective Revelation.* This may be either immediate, as it was of old to the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apoſtles: To whom God himſelf immediatly did ſpeak, and dictate his will without the Intervention of any thing; as a *medium*, or mids, Declaring that *Revelation* to the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, and *Apoſtles*, or it may be mediat, as it was in reſpect of thoſe, to whom the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, and *Apoſtles* delivered it, and as it is in reſpect of us, for whoſe ſake the Prophets and Apoſtles wrote it. *Rom.* 15. 4. The other thing neceſſary for the Production *of Saving Faith*, is the operation or influence of the *Spirit* of *God*, whereby the vail of natural blindneſſe is removed, and the eyes of the ſoul, or the underſtanding are opened to know, and believe the wonderful things contained in *Gods* written Law, and to ſee theſe divine *Characters* that are imprinted upon the Scriptures, and to underſtand the Scriptures from the Scriptures themſelves: ſo that the Perſon thus ſavingly illuminated, attendeth to, and heartily cloſeth with what is delivered in the Scriptures: And this is ordinarly called *Subjective Revelation*, or more properly, *Illumination*, or an application of the Revelation made already, *hactenus facta*, as *Dr. Baron.* ſpeaketh. This Doctrine is clear and moſt intelligible to all that will not cloſe their eyes: The Truth of which is proven by the following Scriptures. *Pſal.* 119.

18. *Luk.* 24: 46. 2 *Cor.* 3. 15, 16. *Rev.* 3. 18. *Act.* 16. 14, 15. *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27. This Diſtinction is very requiſite for clearing of our purpoſe, and liberateth our Doctrine from the Circle, which is falſly objected unto us by both *Papiſts*, and *Quakers.*

A DIGRESSION,

In which the Doctrine of the **Reformed** *Churches, anent the neceſſity of the Spirits Operation, in order to firm, and ſaving* Knowledge, *and belief o the* **Holy** *Scriptures is* **Explained,** *and Vindicated from the* **Exceptions** *of* Papiſts *and Quakers:*

FIrſt, all the *Reformed Churches* do with on Conſent aſſert, that in order to a firm and ſaving knowledge, and Divine Faith or believing of the Scriptures the *illumination*, and *operation of the Spirit of God*, illuminating, and preparing the Soul is abſolutly neceſſary, this all the *Confeſſions* witneſſe, and our Divines, ſuch as *Calvin* in his *Inſtitution*, Polan in his *Syntagma*, demonſtratively evince. Th Doctrine is impugned on the one hand by the Papiſts, who object firſt, that we commit a *Ci cl* *cle*. 2. That we are guilty of Enthuſiaſtick dottages, of which we juſtly accuſe the *Anabaptiſts*, and *Quakers*, and the like *Enthuſiaſts*; with theſe the *Socinians*, and other Enemies of the grace of God, joyn forces accuſing us of the ſame *Crimes*. On the other hand, the *Quakers* perceiving themſelves unextricably in the briers, and unwilling to be alone, affirm confidently that we cannot ſeparat our ſelves from them; as to this matter.

3. In order to the ſilencing of both theſe parties, who like *Samſons* Foxes, when they appear moſt oppoſite one to another, even then conſpire moſt firmly the ruine of the Church of God: I premit; that in order to the production of true Faith, in God's ordinary way, and method, two things are neceſſary as the principles thereof, the *Word* and the *Spirit*. The Word they call *principium objectivum*, an *objective principle*, or an *objective revelation*, becauſe the Scriptures concur *objectively* declaring truths to be believed, even, as the Sun objectively demonſtrateth, and ſheweth things that may be ſeen, though no eyes were open to ſee them: ſo the *Scriptures* hold forth clearly all that we ought to believe and do, even though the underſtanding of none were opened to behold the wonders contained in *Gods written* Law. And again as the *ſcriptures* hold forth other *Truths*, ſo they evidently declare, and manifeſt the *Characters* of their *Divinity*; Even as the Sun proveth himſelf to be the Sun, by his own irradiant, and illuſtrious Beams of Light. And as the Sun muſt be ſuppoſed to be an *objective light* declaring himſelf,

ſelf, and other things: The ſame we ſay of the *Scriptures*, that in themſelves they contain, and hold forth theſe heavenly Rays, and glorious Beams, and Characters of *Divinity*, prior to the *Spirits* opening of the underſtanding, and enclining the will for perception, and embracing thereof. Now notwithſtanding of all this, poor mankind blind by nature, ſhould be in perpetual darkneſſe, if his eyes were not opened. Hence another *Principle* is neceſſary *viz. The Spirits gracious operations enlightening, and ſweetly enclining, fitting, and diſpoſing the Soul; Which is the ſubject, or recipient of this light, to underſtand, and believe the things contained in theſe heavenly Oracles.* And all theſe the Spirit doth; not by dictating or telling into the ear, or mind that ſuch and ſuch excellent things are contained in *theſe Writings*; as a man making an oration, to commend ſuch or ſuch a thing, but (as we ſaid already) by removing the natural miſt, and darkneſs, *modo efficientis, aut Divini inſtrumenti; by way of Efficient or divine inſtrument* in the Hand of *God*: For the Divine Beauty, and Celeſtial Glory of the Scriptures is ſo tranſcendent, that the removal of the natural blindneſs, and pravity of the will, is enough for raviſhing of the hearts into ardent Love, obſequious Obedience, and (in a word) a moſt entire, and total captivity unto them. This working of the *Spirit* upon the ſoul, is commonly called *Subjective Revelation*, becauſe it terminateth upon the ſoul, which is the *ſubject*, or *recipient* of the light contained in the

Word, and may be more properly called an application of *Divine Revelation*, than Revelation it ſelf. This *ſubjective working of the Spirit*, both the *Scriptures* themſelves, and all ſound Divines illuſtrat, according to them, by the *opening of the eyes*, Pſ. 119. 18. *Eye-ſalve*, Rev, 3. 18. Which Examples both illuſtrate, and prove the purpoſe, yea it is obſervable, that in all the *Scriptures* the *Holy Ghoſt* mentioneth no other kind of *Revelation* as neceſſary to Salvation; but only *objective*, which indeed was ſometimes *immediat*, but not neceſſarily ſo, but other ſome times *mediat*, and this *ſubjective Revelation*, or *illumination of the* Spirit: In a word for any thing we can find is all one, whether the *objective* Revelation be *mediat*, or *immediat*, providing it be *Divine*, ſee among other ſcriptures *Pſ.* 119. 18. *Luk.* 24, 46, *Act.* 16, 14, 31, 32, 33, 34. 2. *Cor.* 3, 15, 16. *Rev.* 3. 18.

4. Having premiſed, and illuſtrated this diſtinction, I come in the next place directly to remove the *Objections*. And firſt that of the *Circle*, in which the *Papiſts* endeavour to entangle us. For they object; that we being demanded, how we know the *Scriptures* to be the *Word of God*? we anſwer, by the *Teſtimony* and *Opertaion* of the *Spirit*: And again being demanded, how we know the *Spirit of Truth*, and diſcern it from the *Spirit of* Error? We anſwer by the *Scriptures*. Hence they conclude that we run the round, and anſwer the ſame by the ſame, and ſo make a compleat *Circle*. To which I anſwer that there is here no *Circle*, for

a *Circle* is *progreſsus ab eodem ad idem eodem modo cognitum. A Progreſs from the ſame, to the ſame thing, by the ſame kind of Argumentation.* But ſo it is not here. For there is not the ſame way of Argumentation. For the *Word* concurreth *objectively*, declaring, and holding forth what are the true κριτήρια or *Characters* of the *Spirit of God argumentatively*: ſo that we can reaſon, becauſe ſuch a *Spirit*, *v. g.* He that confeſſeth Jeſus Chriſt hath come in the Fleſh, is ſaid by the *Scripture* to be of *God*; therefore I know, and believe that this is true Doctrine, and that this *Spirit* is of *God.* But on the other hand we make no ſuch uſe of the *Spirits inward Teſtimony*, or *Operations.* We do not with the phanatical *Enthuſiaſts* reaſon thus, the *Spirit*, or a *ſtrong impulſe*, which they call the *Spirit*, bids me believe that ſuch and ſuch *Books*, are the *Scriptures*, therefore I believe them to be ſo. We ſay, no ſuch thing. We only ſay, that the *Spirits operations*, are neceſſary for diſpoſing the Soul, to perceive, and underſtand the things contained in the *Scriptures* themſelves, and apply the ſame, ſo that either for his own ſatiſfaction, or redarguing of others, he ſtill rationally deduceth all his Arguments from the *Scriptures*, making them, or (which is all one) God ſpeaking in them, the *formal Object*, and *ultimat ground* wherein to reſolve his Faith. Two *Examples* I will give to illuſtrat my anſwer, and then I have done. The firſt is that known Example of the *Eye-ſalve*, and the *Sun*: For one by the *Eye-ſalve*, or ſome efficacious Medicament of this nature removing the *Tunicle*, may come to the ſight and knowledge of the *Sun:* So that he may ſay, by means of the *Salve*, or its opening of the Eyes he ſeeth, and knoweth the *Sun*, and again by the *Suns* light he may perceive what is *Eye-ſalve*, and what not. This egregiouſly illuſtrateth the purpoſe, and yet is many ſtages from a *circle*. The ſecond Example is of a Logician, his Reaſon, and his *Syſteme of Logick*, which containeth Rules, to diſcern ſound reaſon from fallacy and ſophiſtry. For the Logician knoweth by his own reaſon, that ſuch a Book is ſound, containing true Reaſon, and not fallacies. This he can demonſtrat by his own Reaſon, as the mean, and yet doth not thus argument, my own reaſon teacheth me ſo, therefore it is ſo, but from reaſon *in actu exercito*, and the nature of the things contained in the *Book*, which by means of his own reaſon he ſeeth to be clear Truths. And again by the *Book* he knoweth what is ſound reaſon, and what not. By this time, I hope we are fully freed of the Circle; in which the *Romaniſts* would fain have us entangled; being covetous of company: for I could requit them with two unextricable Circles, if time did permit.

5. I come to the Removal of the ſecond *Objection, viz* that we cannot diſtinguiſh our ſelves in this point from *Quakers*, and the like *Enthuſiaſts*. This Objection not only the *Papiſts*, but alſo the *Quakers* urge what they can, to the end, that they may make the *Reformed Churches* ſym-

bolize with themſelves. To this purpoſe *Robert Barclay* in his *Apology* attempted to make *Calvin*, the *French*, and *Dutch Confeſſions*, and the *Weſtminſter Divines* Patroniſers of their Doctrine; becauſe they ſaid, that we cannot firmly know, and ſavingly believe the Divinity of the *Scriptures*, without the inward *Teſtimony*, or *Operation* of the *Spirit of God*. But he calleth the *Divines* of *Weſtminſter dark*, *diſhoneſt*, and *confuſed*, becauſe they did not ſeparat the *Word* from the *Spirit*: but ſaid, that this *Teſtimony*, or *Operation of the Spirit* was in and with the *Word*, but neglecteth the conſideration of, *Iſai.* 59. 21, the Scripture upon which they build this their ſaying. And again *Vind.* pag. 33. Where he abridging his *Apology* bringeth up again theſe things, *ut reſpondeant ultima primis*, he neglecteth the ſpecial, and chief Reaſons, whereby his adverſary *pag.* 61. ſhewed that there was no diſcord between *Calvin*, *French*, and *Dutch Confeſſions*, and our *Divines*. Add hereto that it is well known that there was never the leaſt controverſy between the *Brittiſh*, and *Tranſmarine* Proteſtants on this head, but contrariwiſe a moſt entire harmony. Having therefore diſcovered this none-ſuch weakneſs, and extream diſingenuity, I come directly to the *objection*, and anſwer both *Papiſts*, and *Quakers* together, we diſtinguiſh our ſelves from theſe *Enthuſiaſts*; for, *firſt* the Work of the *Spirit*, the neceſſity of which we maintain is only *ſubjective*, being rather, if we will ſpeak properly, an application of the things revealed in Scripture, than a *Revelation*, or *Teſtimony*

mony ſtrickly ſo taken; whereas the Revelation to which the *Quakers* pretend, is altogether *objective*, like that of the *Prophets*. 2. We aſſert, the *ſufficiency* of the *Scriptures* as a Rule, containing all things neceſſary to be believed, or done: Which they deny. 3. We aſſert the *Scriptures* to be the *principal*, and *ultimate rule* into which our Faith is laſtly to be reſolved. Hence we examine all Doctrines of men, all internal Suggeſtions by the *Scriptures*; as the infallible Teſt, or Touchſtone; hence we maintain that the *Spirit's Teſtimonie* is ſtill in, and with the *Word*, ſo that it may be known, what is the true, and what is the falſe *Spirit* by the *Word*, ſo that the work of the *Spirit* is; to enlighten the underſtanding, and diſpoſe the ſoul to perceive the Characters of *Divinity*, naturally ingraffed in the *Scriptures*. All which the *Quakers* deny, and aſſert the quite contrary. Now this our Doctrine is by a full, and moſt harmonious conſent delivered, and aſſerted by the *reformed Churches*, and moſt eminent, and ſhining lights therein. *Luthers* words are, that *if any thing ſhould deliver any Doctrine, which it could not prove by Scripture, he would ſpit in its face, knowing certainly that it were the Devil. Sinopſis* Pur. *Theol, Diſp.* 2 Pag. 20. But *the Holy Ghoſt by theſe Divine Characters of the Scripture, begetteth Divine, and ſaving Faith in our hearts. Maccov. Loci. Com:* pag. 28. *The Teſtimony of the Spirit is a light, ſo enlightening our underſtanding, that it followeth it ſweetly, and ſheweth the arguments in the things themſelves, impreſſed in the* *things which are to be believed, but before unknown.* Woleb.Comp. Theol: pag. 4. *The Spirit of God perſwadeth the hearts of Believers internally of the Divinity of the Scriptures, in ſo much as he openeth the eyes, and illuminateth the heart of him, who after previous invocation of the Spirit of God readeth the Scriptures, ſo that by this illumination the man ſhal behold the wonderful things of God, and acknowledge Gods Voice ſpeaking in the Scriptures.* The like Doctrine hath *Wallet*, in his *Sinopſis Papiſmi gener. Contr.* in many places; where he aſſerteth in *terminis, that this Teſtimony of the Spirit is in, and with the Scriptures.* The Words of godly, and learned *Whitaker are* clear as they are cited by Mr. *Crawford* in a ſhort but learned tractat de *Princ. fid. obj. et effect*: *Whereas ye ſay that we reject the Teſtimony of the Church, and judge our ſelves taught by the alone internal perſwaſion of the Spirit , we hold the Miniſtry of the Church in honour: internal perſwaſions without the external word we ſhun, as ſanatical impoſtures; we judge out of the ſcriptures, we believe with the ſcriptures, or becauſe of their Teſtimony, and therefore Hereticks*, i. e. *Enthuſiaſts we neither are, nor can be.* But of all men moſt clearly Calv. Inſt. L. 1, C. 9. aſſerteth our Doctrine, and ſtrongly refuteth theſe Enthuſiaſts, for *Sect* 1. he thus ſpeaketh, *furthermore theſe who having rejected the ſcriptures, imagine to themſelves a way, I know not what* of approaching to God, are *to be judged not ſo much poſſeſſed with error, as acted with madneſs, there* *have ariſen of late ſome giddy heady perſons, who diſdainfully pretending the rule of the ſpirit caſt off all reading, and deride the ſimplicity of theſe who follow the dead, and killing Letter (as they term it) But I would know of them what ſpirit that is, by whoſe breathing they are ſo lifted up, as to be bold to deſpiſe the Doctrine of the ſcriptures as abject, and childiſh; if they anſwer, it is the ſpirit of Chriſt, that ſecurity muſt be very ridiculous, for I believe they will grant the Apoſtles of Chriſt, and others faithful in the primitive Church to have been illuminat by no other Spirit; but none of theſe learned from it to contemn the word of God, but every one of them had them rather in greater reverence; as their writings plainly teſtify. And indeed ſo it was foretold by Iſaiah, for when he ſayeth, my ſpirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhal not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed for ever; he doth not tie the people of the Jews to an outward Doctrine, as if he taught them the firſt principles, but rather, that it will be the true, and ful felicity of the Church in Chriſts Kingdom, to be ruled no leſs by the voice, than ſpirit of God. From whence we collect, that what are inviolably conjoyned by the Prophet, are moſt ſacrilegiouſly ſeparat by theſe Villans.* And again Sect. 2. *If any ſpirit neglecting the Wiſdom of God, bring any other Doctrine he is juſtly to be ſuſpected of vanity and of a lie. What when ſatan transfigureth himſelf into an angel of light, what Authority ſhall the ſpirit have with us except it be diſcerned by ſome ſure Character? and he is clearly demonſtrat* *to us by the Voice of God, except theſe miſerable men deſire willingly to run into their own Deſtruction, when they rather ſeek the ſpirit from themſelves, than from the ſpirit of God. But they pretend that it is unworthy that the ſpirit of God, to whom all things are to be ſubjected, ſhould be ſubjected to the ſcriptures, as if it were ignominious to the Holy Ghoſt to be every where alike, and conform to himſelf, and never diverſe, indeed if it were tryed by a humane, angelick or any other Rule, he were to be corrected, or chaſtiſed (if ye will) but while it is compared with it ſelf, while it is conſidered in it ſelf, who will then ſay that there is injury done to it, and ſo it is brought to a Tryal I confeſſe, but ſuch a one, as that thereby he would manifeſt to us his Majeſty, it ought to be ſufficient to us, as ſoon as the ſpirit manifeſteth it ſelf to us, but leſt the deluſions of ſatan ſhould creep in under the notion of the ſpirit of God, he would have us know him in his image imprinted in the ſcripture, he is the Author of the ſcriptures, he cannot be unlike, and diverſe from himſelf, whatever therefore he ſheweth himſelf to be in the ſcriptures, ſuch he muſt be forever. That is no contumely to him, except we judge it honour worthy to forſake, and degenerat from it ſelf.* Much more to this purpoſe hath the Reverend and Judicious Author, with which he confoundeth theſe ſpiritual Antichriſtians, as well theſe of our time, as of his own, and indeed if one ſhould read this Chapter, and not know the Author, he would preſently conclude that it had been written of direct purpoſe againſt the Quakers.

kers. Judge therefore, Reader, if *Robert Barclay* had any ground to alledge him as the Patroniſer of his Doctrine. The fourth Difference betwixt us and the Quakers conſiſts in this that we aſſert, if there be a God in Heaven, the Books of the Old and New Teſtament may be evinced to have proceeded from him even to the ſilencing the moſt profligat, though ſharp witted *Atheiſts* ; if any ſuch merit this epithet, whereas on the other hand *They* deny any *Characters of Divinity* ingraffed in the Word, as hath already and ſhal yet more appear, and thus they expoſe the jugular Vein of Chriſtianity to the Heathens, and indeed the whole tendency of all their writings, and diſcourſe, is to decry, and vilify theſe ſacred Oracles, and though they deny this, to the end they may the better cheat ſilly *Souls*, I care not, for out of their own mouths and Books they ſhal be judged, and found guilty. Theſe abominations are not committed in a Corner. It can be made out by the unanimous conſent of all the reformed Churches, which is certainly ſufficient in the caſe. But many other differences I could give, but theſe may ſuffice for anſwer to the ſecond Objection. From all which I conclude, that between the extreams of the *Papiſts Church*, and the Quakers Spirit, *medius tutiſſimus ibit*, the midway by reſolving our faith ultimately in the Scriptures, or in God ſpeaking in them, is the ſafeſt way: And as two extream Vices never agree more in the nature of Vice, than when they receed moſt from Virtue lying in the middle, and therefore ſeemingly or phyſically receed from one another ; ſo the greater odds that ſeem to be between *Papiſts* and *Quakers* they are the more nearly relyed in error : for the Papiſts have gone too low, reſolving their faith ultimately in men; the Quakers on the other hand, attempting to go too high, have contracted a *Vertigo*, hence they Ixion-like thinking to find the fair *Juno* of divine Revelation, but lighting upon a cloud of their own brain, in ſtead thereof have procreat the ſtrange *Hippocentaurs* of their monſtrous Doctrines; at which the World now admires, and is amazed.

5. Our Aſſertion, that the Scriptures are the adequate, compleat, and primary, or principal Rule of Faith, and Manners, we build on theſe following Arguments and firſt,

That which was dictate, or given out by the Infallible God, and containeth the whole Counſel of God, may well ſerve to be our compleat, and principal Rule; but the Scriptures were given out, and dictate by the infallible God, and contain the whole Counſel of God, *ergo*, they may well ſerve to be a compleat, and principal Rule. The *Major* is moſt evident, for what further certainty either ought we, need we, or can we ſeek, for what we believe or do, then the words of the moſt veracious, and unerring God? and no other thing can be underſtood by *a compleat Rule*, but that which containeth all things to be believed, or done. The *Minor* I prove by parts, and firſt, that the Scriptures were given out, and dictat by God, is clear from 2 Tim, 3. 16. *All Scriptures are given by inſpiration of God.* 2 Pet. 1. 21. *Prophecy came not of old time, by the will of man, but holy men of God ſpake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.* Moreover our Adverſaries, at leaſt the more learned, and cautious of them have not yet adventured to deny it, but in words at leaſt grant it. The ſecond part is no leſſe evident from Act. 20. 27. Where *Paul* ſayeth, that *he had not ſhunned to declare to his hearers all the Counſel of God*, compared *with* Chap. 26. 22. where the ſame *Apoſtle* ſayeth, *that he taught no other things than thoſe that were in Moſes, and the Prophets*: Hence it is clear, that even a part of the Scriptures, and by a good conſequence, all the Scriptures contain all that God hath willed us to believe, or do. The ſecond Argument is,

That which was the principal Rule to the Jews, is the principal Rule to us.

But the Scriptures were the principal Rule to them.

Therefore, they muſt be the ſame to us.

The *Major* is *Robert Barclay's*; for which he pleadeth at large *Apol. Cap.* 2. The *Minor* I prove thus, That from which the Jews might not ſwerve, to the right hand, or to the left, and to the deciſion of which they were ultimately bound to ſtand, in all Doubts and Controverſies, and that upon higheſt pains, was the principal Rule. But from Gods written Law, they were commanded not to ſwerve, or ſtray to the Right hand, or left, and were bound ultimately to ſtand to its

Deciſion in all doubts, and Controverſies, and that under higheſt paines: Therefore to them it was the primary Rule; the *Major Propoſition* is incontrovertible, The *Minor* is proved from two moſt pregnant places of Scripture, *Deut.* 5. 31, 32. and 17, 9, 10, 11. In both which places by *the Law* is to be underſtood, that which God gave unto the *Jews* by *Moſes* in writing, as is evident to any, that read the Texts. Which Texts have been egregiouſly vindicat by our Divines writing againſt *Bellarmin* , and the reſt of the aſſerters of papal infallibility: with whoſe ſhifts I am certain all that the *Quakers* can ſay will be found to co-incide. 2. This *Minor Propoſition* is clear from *Iſ.* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony: If they ſpeak not according to theſe, it is because there is no light in them.* The firſt Shift that the *Quakers* uſe to elude the force of this *Scripture* with, is, that by *Law & Teſtimony*, is meaned *the light within.* So ſayeth *Robert Barclay* in both *Apology*, and *Vindication*: but for this expoſition we muſt take their word, for none of them giveth the leaſt colour of Reaſon for it: But that by *this Law* the *Scriptures* are to be underſtood theſe following Texts evince, *Exod.* 32. 15. *and* 34. 29. *Deut.* 31. 24, 26. 2 *King.* 22. 8. *Nehem,* 8. *v.* 3, 8. *Pſal.* 78. 5. Again God commanded, that even the King himſelf (and conſequently the reſt of the people) *Deut.* 17. 18, 19. *Should live according to this written* Law, *to the end, he might fear the Lord*; under which all the Duties of Religion are ordinarly comprehended.

Now ſhal any be ſo ſtupid as to believe, when a doubt aroſe, that the King was not bound to apply himſelf, to this written Law, for the diſcuſſing thereof? or that, tho the Kings doubt had been moſt clearly diſcuſſed by the Law, he was bound to wait for a miraculous Revelation from Heaven to determine him? I ſay, who in his wit will believe this? yea, to think ſo, is to deny the immutability of *God*. Moreover this is by far the more frequent acceptation of the Word, *Law or Teſtimony*. Hence when the ſaving Work of *Grace* is underſtood by the Word *Law*, there is ſomething added, whereby we may underſtand that the Word *Law* is to be taken in a more unuſual acceptation, as *Rom.* 7. 23. and 8. 2. But we need ſay no more, for they ſufficiently overthrow this their Expoſition, in that they give nothing for the proof thereof, except it be their own moſt abſurd Hypotheſis. But *Robert Barclay* hath yet another ſhift: he granteth that this place may be underſtood of the Scriptures, and aſſerteth that this is only ſpoken to the Jews, and therefore that to them the Scriptures were a more principal Rule, than to us; and that as they were to try all things by the outward Law, ſo we are to try all in the firſt place by the word within, and accuſeth his Antagoniſt of baſe diſingenuity, for leaving out theſe words *in the firſt place*: And granteth only that the Scriptures were a more principal Rule to the *Jews*, but denyeth that they were the primary Rule. *Anſ.* Whatever be underſtood by *Law and Teſtimony* in that place, whether it be the Scriptures, or *Spirit* it muſt be the *primary Rule*, for to this Law they were ultimately bound: for the *Law* and *Teſtimony* ſpoken of here, was the ultimate, and Principal Rule, becauſe whatever was ſpoken not according to theſe was to be rejected, as the product of darkneſs. 2. It is evident that this *Law* and *Teſtimony*, here ſpoken of is the abſolutely *principal*, and *ultimate* Rule, becauſe to ſeek to it, is all one with ſeeking unto *God*: The Text is, Let *a people ſeek unto their God*, viz. ſpeaking in the Law and Teſtimony, which is put for one and the ſame thing. Hence we ſee that this Law and *Teſtimony*, here ſpoken of, was the abſolutely principal Rule to the Jews. In the third place, the Charge of *diſingenuity*, that he layeth to his Adverſary, is altogether groundleſſe: for certainly he, or any man elſe of Senſe, and Reaſon, was bound to underſtand thoſe words, *In the firſ place*, in the one branch of the Parallel, as well as ir the other, otherwiſe his *Parallel* will not only hault, but prove wholly lame, and without ſenſe; now ſeing as I think, he will not deny that his Adverſary ought to ſuppoſe, he had to do with a Man of ſenſ and Reaſon, who dealt but rationally in underſtanding both Branches of the Parallel to run alike. He ought not thus to accuſe him, but ſein he will have himſelf to be thus underſtood, to th end that he may evite a ſelf Contradiction, let u ſee if he have any advantage hereby: Now the en why he maketh his Parallel ſo manked, is that h may not be compelled to grant the Scriptures, t have been the primary Rule to the Jews; and f

th

this he earneſtly pleadeth: but if they were not a primary and principal Rule to them, and ſo but a ſecondary Rule only, and yet have not ſuch a high, and principal place under the New Teſtament, as under the old, then they ſhal not be ſo much as a ſecondary Rule to us, and therefore but a tertiary only. And if this be not beſide a Contradiction to the *Quakers* own conceſſions, who grant the Scriptures to be a ſecondary Rule, a complex of moſt horrible impiety, moſt wild and abſurd nonſenſe that can readily be imagined, I leave to the whole Chriſtian World to judge: from which many other wild dottages clearly flow, ſuch as, The *Spirit it ſelf is but a ſecondary Rule*, even altho it be a Rule; or elſe, that *although the Church have a tertiary, yet it wants a ſecondary Rule*: with theſe and many other ſuch horrid, and moſt nonſenſical Conſequences is this Doctrine of the *Quakers* inſeparably attended. And whereas in the laſt place *he requireth proof*, wherefore *Mr. Brown* rejecteth the verſion of the *Septuagint*, we ſhal only referre him to ſolid *Baillie* in his *Chronology*, and acute *Vogleſange* in his *Theological exercitations*, where he will find the *Septuagint* rejected with Reaſon enough. Thus far *Robert Barclay*.

George Keith, the other *Champion* of the *Quakers*, in his Book againſt *Mr. John Alexander* (falſly called *Truth Defended*, its true name being *Truth depraved*) *Pag.* 80, *Sheweth* his cauſe to be mortally wounded, with the force of this *Scripture Argument*, for he dare not expreſly deny, that by *Law* and *Teſtimony* the *Scriptures* are to be underſtood, & indeed he really granteth it, in that he adventureth not to handle any of the places of *Scripture* brought by *Mr. Alexander*, for the proof thereof, and yet he detaineth the *Truth* captive, and will not confeſſe, that which he dare not deny. The ſhift which he uſeth is the ſame with *Robert Barclays* ſecond ſhift, viz. That *tho the Scriptures are in this place to be underſtood* by Law *and* Teſtimony, *yet it will not follow that they are the principal Rule, eſpecially in Goſpel times*: which ſhift is the ſame way removed, that R*obert Barclays* was. And here he eſſayeth to prove, that people are ſent to the *Dictate*, *Word*, or Light within, from 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. *Deut.* 30. 14. R*om.* 10. 8. *Joh.* 3. 20, 21. *John.* 12. 36. Which places make not a whit for his purpoſe, yea diverſe of them cut the Jugular Vein of *Quakeriſm*, as ſhal be evinced in due time. He hath moreover here a *harangue*, by which he would prove, as it ſeemeth, that God and Chriſt dwell perſonally in Believers, as God dwelleth in the humane Nature of *Chriſt*, which is moſt abominable and falſe, and tho it were true, yet ſhould make nothing for him; for *God* and *Chriſt*, can only be ſaid to dwell in Believers, whoſe Temples they only are. But if he meaneth that God dwelleth in *Believers*, only in reſpect of the habits of Grace, implanted in their Souls, whereby they are enlightned, quickened, and upſtirred to believe, and practiſe the Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, then he ſayeth nothing; for this indwelling, or God thus indwelling is not our principal Rule of Faith, and Manners, but the chief Leader and efficient Cauſe of Grace in the Soul. And thus this hodge-podge of moſt impertinent Words, reſolves at length into a direct begging of the Queſtion.

Argument, 3d. Chriſt and his Apoſtles proved their Doctrine from the Scriptures, referred their hearers unto them; for the final Deciſion of the moſt grave, and weighty controverſies, that ever aroſe in the world, and ſent all people unto them, as unto a ſure and undeceiving Light, by the guidance of which, we may paſſe through this dark World, and be kept from Hell in the cloſe; *Ergo* the Scriptures are the primary Rule. The Conſequence is clear, if we attend unto the Deſcription of a primary Rule laid down above. The Antecedent I prove from *Math.* 22. 29, 31, 32. *Joh.* 5. 39. *Act.* 17. 11. and 13. from the 14. to 42. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. *Luk.* 16. 31. Our Adverſaries like bats, hateing, and ſtriking at the Light, aſſault moſt of theſe Scriptures. And firſt they endeavour to deprave, “ *Matth.* 22. 29. *by telling* “ *us*, that it will no more follow, that the Scrip- “ tures are the Rule of Faith, and Manners than the “ Power of God: yea the Power of God, *ſay* “ *they*, is rather the Rule, being that which quick- “ neth the Soul and Body; without which none “ can truly know the Scriptures, thus talketh *George Keith*, in *Truth Defended* Pag. 68. But this is only a roving at pleaſure without conſideration, what be ſaid, providing that the name of the laſt ſpeaker be obtained; for here he confoundeth the Rule with the power, whereby we walk according to the Rule: Hence, as I admoniſhed above, he fighteth not againſt our Doctrine, but againſt the fiction of his confounding brain; for whoever ſaid, that *Euclide* cannot be a Rule, for *Geometricians* to walk by, becauſe it cannot inſtill a faculty of reaſon in an Idiot, without which it cannot be underſtood? ſurely, he that ſhould thus Reaſon, would be accounted of all men moſt ridiculous. And yet no leſſe ridiculous is this ſilly ſophiſter; for he reaſoneth the ſame way. But that I may fully declare either the profound ſtupidity or willful prejudice of this *Quaker*. I ſuppoſe that a man in diſcourſe with another about the Kings Power, ignorantly denyeth that the King can do ſomething, which by the *Laws* of the land he is allowed to do; the other checks him thus, you erre, not knowing the Laws of the Land, and the power of the King; And then proveth from the ſaid Laws, that the King hath power to effect that which the other denyed. Now ſhould not any man, that concluded from this mans diſcourſe, that the power of the King is all one with the Laws of the Land, or that the power of the King is our Rule in Civils, no leſs than the Laws of the Land are, expoſe himſelf to the ſcorn of all knowing perſons: And yet the inference of this *Quaker* differeth not a whit from ſuch a blockiſh Concluſion. Hence we may ſee, that theſe Mens deſign is not to ſpeak well, but to ſpeak laſt. The next place is, *Joh.* 5. 39. To which *Robert Barclay Vind.* Pag. 43. attempting to make anſwer, to the end that he may put it beyond all doubt, that he is a devout

Servant to his Holineſſe, and a true *Roman* Catholick, ſtifly aſſerteth, that the Word is to be taken in the *indicative mode*, ſuperciliouſly rejecting not only all the *reformed*, and Body of *primitive* Interpreters, but alſo the very *Jeſuits* themſelves, in whom there is any ſpark of Conſcience, or Candour, who all underſtand it in the *imperative moode*, and good Reaſon they have ſo to do, ſeing the reading of the Scriptures is all along through the whole Scriptures both commanded. *Deut.* 17, 18, 19. *Deut.* 29. 29. *Exod.* 13. 9: *Joſ.* 22. 5. *Deut.* 6.8. and 11. 18. *Iſa.* 8. 20. 1 *Tim.* 4. 13. with many others, and commended *Deut.* 33. 10. *Neh.* 8. 2, 3. *Act.* 17. 11. and 18. 24. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. *Rev.* 1. 3. Beſides many more, which are ſufficient to convince theſe men of palpable falſhood, and blaſphemy. . Moreover there is ſufficient ground from the Context, abundantly to make out our expoſition; for *Chriſt* appeals to the *Scriptures*, as ſufficient to decide the then preſent controverſy betwixt him and the *Jews*, ſaying, *Theſe are they that teſtifie of me.* Where he willeth them to give heed to *Moſes* writings in order to the deciſion of the Controverſy. *v.* 46. *Had ye believed Moſes, ye would have believed me.* But this ſubterfuge failing him, he hath yet ſome others, which we muſt alſo remove: he asketh therefore in the next place, whether the words that *Chriſt* ſpake to the *Jews*, which are recorded in *Scripture*, were leſs binding to them than the words ſpoken by *Moſes* and the *Prophets*? " If they were leſſe "binding, (*ſaith he*) then he overturneth his "own tedious Reaſonings, by which he laboureth "to prove that they are obligative, and alſo he muſt "ſhow how they are binding now upon us; "And if he ſay, they were binding to the Jews, "becauſe ſpoken by Chriſt, his proof falleth to the "ground. *Anſ.* 1. Perhaps he pleaſed himſelf with this Argument, having racked his wit to invent *ſophiſtry*, tho blunt (as ſhal appear preſently) whereby the more to delude his already deluded admirers; But I am ſure, to any rational man that is in earneſt, it will not have the weight of a Walnut: Nor trouble him much, even tho he were not in caſe to anſwer it, ſeing if this word be to be taken in the imperative mood, as we have even now demonſtrat, then it is as clear as the noon-ſun, that *Chriſt* ſendeth the Jews to the *Scriptures*, for the ultimate deciſion of the greateſt *Controverſy* in the World, upon which their *one thing* depended: Otherwiſe the Jews might ſtill have with good Reaſon replyed, that this would not do the turn, ſeing the Scriptures themſelves were but a ſecondary Rule, to be ſubjected unto another, without the Determination of which, they could never acquieſce in the Scriptures deciſion, how clearly ſoever they ſpeak for the one party, and againſt the other. I anſwer 2dly, that the words of *Chriſt* ſpoken both before and at that time, were binding on the Jews, he having given ſufficient proofs of his Deity; Notwithſtanding of which Chriſt referreth them to thoſe Writings about the divinity of which they were beyond all doubting, and had abundance of ſubjective, as well as objective certainty : To theſe, *I* ſay, he referreth them as the P*rincipal Rule*, and *Teſt*, whereby to determine the great *Controverſy* then in agitation : I ſay, in a Word that the words, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* ſpake, and now recorded in Scriptures, were of themſelves no leſſe binding on the *Jews*, than theſe ſpoken by *Moſes* and the P*rophets*, tho the *Jews*, throw their wilfull *ignorance*, and *prejudice*, which was their own great fault [the great Cauſe of which, was the neglect of the *Scriptures*, which teſtifie of Chriſt] did not believe the Divinity of the one, as they did that of the other ; hence one of the horns of this *Dilemma* is broken, and his conſequence a meer *non ſequitur*. He here grants, that if *Chriſts* Doctrine ought to be tried by the *Scriptures*, then much more private *Enthuſiaſms* : But denyeth , that it will hence follow, that the *Scriptures* are the primary Rule, which I prove; for if the Doctrine of *Chriſt* be ſubject to the *Scriptures* trial, then no man can deny, that even theſe things, which are divine immediat Revelations, may be brought to the Scripture trial, that we may know, whether they be divine or not, as well as the Jews ought to bring the Doctrine of Chriſt to the *Scriptures*, that they might clearly ſee, whether it was divine or not, ſeing whatever can be ſaid for exemption of theſe Revelations from trial, with good ground ; might be ſaid for exeeming of the Doctrine of *Chriſt*. Moreover by granting, that privat *Enthuſiaſms* ought to be tryed by the Scriptures, he yieldeth all he was this whole time pleading for, which was, that, *it might be lawful to embrace any impulſe, or ſuggeſtion, which he thought was the Spirit of God, without further examination thereof.*

The third *Scripture*, viz. *Act.* 17. 11. is ſo clear, that our Adverſaries can find nothing wherewith to darken and deprave it. It is true, that Robert *Barclay, Vind. pag.* 44. *ſayeth, It is the ſame way anſwered as John* 5. 39. Therefore I ſay, our meaning is the ſame way vindicate. Next all his verbal ſhifts are wholly excluded here, ſeing ſuch an high commendation given by the Spirit of God to theſe *Bereans*, ought to have no leſſe weight with us than a Command.

The next place aſſaulted by them is 2 *Pet*. 1. 19. *We have a more ſure word of prophecy* &c. which place they will have to be underſtood of the *Spirit*, not of the Scriptures; of which aſſertion, " Robert Barclay pag. 26. *giveth this Reaſon*, " that the Deſcription or Narration of a thing, " is not more ſure than the hearing or ſeeing of " the ſame, and therefore the Scriptures, which " are but a Narration, and Deſcription of ſuch and " ſuch things, cannot be more ſure than the ſight " or hearing of the ſame. Hence he would infer, that the diſcoveries the *Apoſtles* had made to them upon the mount were really ſurer, than the *Scriptures*, but not ſo ſure as the Spirit. *George Keith, Truth Defended pag.* 63. hath a long diſcourſe, which reſolves in this, that the Apoſtle is making a Compariſon between Gods outward Word to the Ear, and inward to the Heart, which he ſayeth, *is more ſure to a man, than Gods immediat ſpeaking, if it be heard with the outward ear.* But ſuch reaſoning as this is as eaſily everthrown as invented: for it preſuppoſeth that there cannot be immediat *Revelation*, where the Teſtimony of the ſenſes goes along; And ſo their ſpirit is an enemy to ſenſe: Otherwiſe why ſhould this glorious viſion made to the *Apoſtles*, of the Truth of which they had divine, and infallible evidence, to whom God ſpake as immediatly as to *Moſes* on the Mount, be accounted uncertain, and ſuſpected in reſpect of the *Spirit?* 2. To talk at this rate is to preſuppoſe, that wherever God revealeth himſelf unto any perſon, ſome other way, than by ſpeaking into his ear; that this *Revelation* bringeth along with it its own evidence, and perſwadeth the ſoul to embrace, and cloſe with it, as divine, which is both groundleſſe, and therefore falſe and contrary to their own principles, who aſſert, *that unleſſe the underſtanding be well diſpoſed*, Revelation, tho immediat is not evident. 3. *It* inſinuateth, that the *A*poſtle in this compariſon, gave out that one of the things compared, was in it ſelf really more uncertain than the other, which is moſt falſe, ſeing conſidered in themſelves, both real immediat *R*evelation, and the Scriptures, have all certainty poſſible, therefore this is only to be underſtood in reſpect of us, to whom the Scriptures are more ſure, in that they are leſſe ſubject to be counterfeited, or wreſted by either the Devil, or our own fancy, than immediat *R*evelations are. The

Apoſtle hath alſo his eye upon his Countrey-men the *Jews*, to whom he ſpeaketh, who tho they were now Chriſtians, gave in ſpecial manner credit to the old *Teſtament*, as *Act* 17. 11. and elſe where. 4. Tho by *this more ſure word of Prophecy* were underſtood *immediat Revelations*, the advantage that the Quakers could reap thereby could not be great: For this *Word of Prophecy* being ſtudied and attended to, is recommended to us by the *Apoſtle*, as that whereby we may come to the genuine interpretation of the Scriptures: Hence it will follow, even according to the Quakers expoſition, that the Scriptures are the principal Rule of our Faith, ſeing that if any of the two be it, the Text to be explained, much rather than the means or helps, whereby it is to be explained, ought to have this Denomination; we have ſeen the invalidity of his Reaſon, as alſo the ſmall advantage, tho it had been valid. We ſhal in the next place ſhew, why by this *more ſure word of Prophecy*, we underſtand the Scriptures: And firſt, becauſe any phraſe of the like import (as for this λογος προφητικος a *prophetick Word*, or *Word* of *Prophecy*, it is not in all the *Scripture* beſide, for any thing I know, in ſo many ſyllables) ſuch as the *Prophets* Luk. 16. 29. *Apoſtles* & *Prophets*, Eph. 2. 20. *The Law and the Prophets Math.* 7. 12. Are always taken for the Scriptures, ſo that when any did utter ſuch expreſſions, but eſpecially, while they diſcourſed of a guide in Faith and Manners, they were ſtill underſtood, as ſpeaking of the Scriptures, who

(*I pray*) ever underſtood that phraſe *Luk.* 16. 31. *Moſes and the Prophets* any other way than that Joh. 6. 45. *It is written in the Prophets.* And indeed, if our Adverſaries were not effronted and impudently bold, they would not adventure to cauſe a phraſe of Scripture to ſpeak that, the contrare of which, at the firſt view it proclaimeth. 2. Who but one that would adventure upon any thing, would make this phraſe, *Word of Prophecy* in the 19 *v.* to ſpeak any other thing, than the *Propkecy* of the *Scriptures* in the 20 *verſe*, or ſimple *Prophecy* in the 21 *verſe*, ſeing to do this, deſtroyeth the whole Connexion of the Context. 3. The ſame is evinced by the connexion of this with the following Words, for the Apoſtle giveth his Reaſon in the 20 Verſe, why in the 19 he had admoniſhed to ſtudy the *Scriptures*, *viz.* that unleſſe they diligently ſearch, and ſtudy them, they would be ready to miſs the genuine, and fall into a private meaning of the *Scriptures*, that is one which the *Scriptures*, if well attended to, would not yield. 4. The ſame is evinced from the general commendation given by the *Spirit of God* to the ſearchers of, or attenders to the Scriptures, as *Iſa.* 8. 20. *Joh.* 5. 39. *Act.* 17. 11. With many other places, which are ſufficient Commentaries to this Text: Whereas on the other hand, theſe our Adverſaries, no leſſe void of Reaſon, then fraughted with audacity, cannot bring one Text commanding us to ſearch or take heed to the Light within: Add to all this, that theſe our Antagoniſts contradict the ſtream of

Orthodox Writers; upon this place, who all give their joint ſuffrage unto our expoſition, as *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Bullinger*, *Chriſtophorus Imlerus*, *Beza*, the *Dutch Divines*, who give the ſame gloſſe with us, yea I dare averr with Confidence, that if we except ſome old *Montaniſts*, *Cataphrygians*, *or* the like antient *Enthuſiaſts*, or of later times, the *Munſerians*, or ſuch Libertines, none hitherto expone this place as the Quakers do; But we muſt yield to them, for, *Hi ſoli ſapiunt, alii velut umbra vagantur*; *Doubtleſs they are the Men, and Wiſdom ſhall die with them*: But I leave them to grapple with their Brother, *William Pen*, who in his *Rejoynder* before cited, *pag.* 334. yieldeth unto us that which they ſo ſtifly deny. *viz.* that by the *More ſure word of Propheſie* the Scriptures are to be underſtood, and I paſſe on to the vindication of Luk. 16. 31. *If they hear not* Moſes *and the Prophets, neither will they be perſwaded, though one roſe from the dead.* Rob: *Barclay* in oppoſition to *Mr: Broun*, Vind. *pag.* 39. 40. reaſoning from this place that the Scriptures are the principal Rule of Faith, ſayeth, firſt, *That it will not follow from the Scriptures being more ſure, than the Teſtimony of one riſen from the dead, that therefore they are more ſure than the Teſtimony of the Spirit.* I *Anſ.* Let him once prove, that every Man hath ſuch a Spirit, as *Quakers* do alledge, and then let the *Spirit* go hand in hand with the Scriptures; but this he ſhall never be able to do. 2. This will follow, that Moſes and the Prophets were a Rule to the Church at that time, Yea even the primarie Rule, otherways might not *Abraham* have ſaid, The Spirit of God directeth every man immediatly, *If* they hear not him, they will hear none elſe, but this he ſaid not: Therefore Abraham (or rather Chriſt in the Parable) judged the Scriptures the principal Rule on Earth. As for what he ſays concerning the *Scriptures, being a principal Rule to the Jews only,* is nothing to the purpoſe, unleſs he prove that they are not ſo to us, which if he hath done, we have ſeen above, 3. Certainly the voice of one of the glorified Spirits, coming from Heaven, where they behold the face of God, is no leſs to be accounted immediat Revelation, than the voice of the High-Prieſt unto the People, when he came out from the Holy of Holies, which in the *Quakers* account was immediate Revelation: *But* the *Quakers* can make what they will to be *Divine Revelation.* To the end that this may more fully appear, we ſhall conſider a paſſage in his *Apologie,* pag. 4. where he maketh an Objection, *viz.* That *after the Diſpenſation of the Law, Gods Method of Speaking was altered.* To which he anſwereth, *that Gods ſpeaking was immediate alwayes to the Jews, in that it was immediat alwayes to the High-Prieſt, from between the Cherubims.* To which I Reply, This Anſwer is ſtrange, In that he ſayes, *The mind of God revealed by the High-prieſt unto the People, was to them immediate Revelation,* for certainly a thing delivered from one perſon to another, by the hand of a third, cometh unto that perſon by the hand of another, which other muſt either be a Medium

or

or *Midſs*, or elſe, he muſt ſay that three make but two, which is a ridiculous Contradiction. 2. We ſay that even according to the *Quakers principles* Gods way of revealing himſelf to us now is as immediate as it was to the Jews, becauſe we have theſe that were inſpired by God ſpeaking unto us, though dead: hence they have no reaſon to go about to prove the *Scriptures*, not to be the principal Rule of Faith on this account, that they are not immediate Revelation, for that which they contend to have been immediat R*evelation*, was no more immediat than the *Scriptures*.

My fourth Argument I draw from. 2 *Tim*. 3. 15. *And that from a Child thou haſt known the Holy Scriptures*, *which are able to make thee Wiſe through Faith unto* Salvation.

From which place, I thus Reaſon.

That which is able to make ſuch an one as Timothy, *called* the Man of God *v* 17. *Wiſe through Faith unto* Salvation, *muſt be a ſufficient Rule of Direction*, to guide *us in our Chriſtian Courſe*.

But the Scriptures *are able to make Timothy, or the Man of God wiſe unto Salvation*; *Therefore they are a ſufficient* Rule, *or Directory to guide us in our Chriſtian Courſe*: And here it may be obſerved, that R. *B. Vind, pag.* 40, 41. is ſo preſſed with the force of this Argument, that he can find no better off-come, but to challenge his Adverſary as guilty of perverſion of Scriptures, becauſe he compared the 15 and 17 verſes together, ſaying, that the Scriptures were able to make the man of God perfect. But to challenge a man for perverſion, upon ſuch a ground as this, is an evident token of too much perverſneſs; for if he had but looked unto the 15 verſe, he might have ſeen, they are ſaid to be δυνάμενα, able to make Timothy, which was a Man of God, wiſe through Faith unto Salvation, where there is an ability or ſufficiency in ſome kind of Cauſe aſcribed to the *Scriptures*. Now no other ſort of ability or ſufficiency can be imagined, if it be not that of a Rule, or *cauſa Exemplaris ſeu directiva*, for Faith is added as the inſtrumental Cauſe; or as the apprehender; *Hence* I evidently infer, that the *Scriptures* are the adequate and primary Rule, for if there were ſome things to be believed and practiſed, not contained in the Scripture, or if the Scriptures were ſubject to another *Teſt* or *Rule* to be examined thereby, without which other *Teſts* or *Rules*, we might be deceived and miſled, then the *S*criptures could not in truth be called able to make the *Man* of God wiſe through Faith unto Salvation. But we need not inſiſt, for how clear ſoever the matter be, little Juſtice, Truth, or fair dealing is to be expected at the hands of thoſe who call *S*criptures compared, *Scriptures perverted*, and deny that as falſe, the Truth of which themſelves cannot but ſee: for I query, what difference can be imagined between theſe two phraſes, *able to make Timothy*, which was a man of God, *wiſe unto Salvation*, and *able to make the Man of God perfect:* To abuſe the Scriptures at this rate, *I* think is groſs and impious enough, and yet no better all along doth this Author treat them: Of which a pregnant Example followeth, for *Vind*.pag.41.in oppoſition to *Mr. Brown*, proving the ſufficiency, and perfection of the Scriptures from *Joh*. 20. 31. 2 *Cor*. 3, 14. *Pſal*. 119. 70. He ſaith, that *from this Doctrine, it would follow, that all Books written after ſuch a time were ſuperfluous.* If this anſwer be ſufficient, many a ſuperfluity there ſhal be in Scripture, for if the writing of a Book after there are ſo many written as contain all things neceſſary for Faith and practiſe, (if we ſay) the writing of another Book, which may be either explicative of the Books before written, or contain many things for the *bene eſſe* of a Chriſtian, be ſuperfluous, how much more then ſhall the repetition of the ſame things, in the ſame words, and the ſame method be ſuperfluous? but according to him the former is true: well then the Quakers Concluſions are, *that the ſcriptures are Battologies.* Laſtly, (for we love rather to plead by the weight, than by the multitude of Arguments) we evince that the *Scriptures* are a compleat, adequate, and primary Rule of Faith, and manners; by the Teſtimony of our *A*dverſaries themſelves: *A*nd firſt, that they are an adequat and compleat Rule is granted by R. B. who *Vind. pag.* 36. ſpeaketh thus, *next he carps at my ſaying, the chief Doctrines of Chriſtianity, are contained in the Scriptures, asking where we may find the whole Doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith? I anſwer freely, In the Scripture.*

And again R, B, and *George Keith* with joint ſuffrages grant, *that the Scriptures are a full enough Declaration of all Doctrines, and principles both eſſential and integral of the Chriſtian Religion. Quak. confirm:* (or rather ſelf confuted) *pag.* 38. Behold, Reader, thou haſt our Adverſaries granting to their own Contradiction all we plead for. The other Branch *(viz.)* that they are the *Primary Rule*, our Adverſaries themſelves alſo at unawares grant, for *Rob: Barclay, in his ſecond Theſe*, ſayeth, *that the Spirit is not to be ſubjected to the outward Teſtimony of the Scriptures as a more noble Rule,* where it is clear that according to him the Spirit may be ſubjected to *the* Scriptures , *tho not as to a more noble and certain Rule*. Now this being granted, the Cauſe is yielded, for it is certain that a *primary rule* is in no caſe to be ſubjected unto its *ſecondary*, or the Rule which is ruled by it. For I think the Acts of *Parliament* are not at all to be ſubjected to theſe of an inferiour Court. Now if the Quakers would hold by this , and grant that a man ſwerveth not from his duty, tho he ſubject all ſuggeſtions , and motions to the *Scriptures* as a ſure Tryal, and *Teſt* thereof, let them call it *a more noble Rule*, or what they will, they might the more eaſily be born with. But it is evident, by their pleading for the Spirit as *their primarie Rule*, that they will in no Caſe ſubject their impulſes and Motions to the Scriptures. Our Adverſaries grant alſo, *That the Scriptures have proceeded from God,and therefore infallible.* Now

I hope that which is infallible, needs not be ſubjected unto, and tryed by a more ſure Rule ; for more ſure than infallible, is impoſſible. I know nothing they can ſay, except that which *G. K.* ſaid on the ſtage at *Aberdeen*, *That we may beguile our ſelves with them,* (viz.) *by interpretation thereof.* To which I anſwer, That the effective illumination of the Spirit of God, is ſufficient to ſecure us from this hazard, which is no more objective Revelation than the Ey e-ſalve is the Sun.

6. But our Adverſaries ſoon repenting of their Liberality, endeavour to overthrow all their own Conceſſions, and to prove that the Scriptures are neither an Adequate, nor Primarie Rule ; ſome of their Objections we ſhall name, that the Reader may Judge of the reſt : And firſt they Object out of *Bellarmine*, *de Certitudine Juſt.* *That the Scriptures cannot ſhew unto a man, that he hath true Faith ; for,* (ſay they as the Jeſuite did before them) *Such a mans Name is not in all the Word of God* : F*or altho the Scriptures contain the true marks of Faith ; who ſhall perſwade me that I have theſe Marks? that I believe ? that I obey?* Thus *R. B.* reaſoned in his *Apelogie* ; To which his Antagoniſt anſwereth, 'That it is no leſs abſurd to ſay, that this is the work of a Rule, than for R. *B.* Suppoſing that he had killed a man, to deny that the Law could put him to death, becauſe no Law ſaith, that *R.* B. hath killed a man ; or to deny that he is a Quaker, becauſe the *Law* ſayeth no ſuch thing of him in particular. To which he replyeth, *Vind.* pag. 45. 46. That ſuch examples

are poor Arguments, and miſerably halt, for R. B. ſaith he, his Confeſſing himſelf to be a Quaker, & acknowledging every one of their Doctrines, is enough to prove him one in the ſenſe of the Law of the Land, and the Judge is to condemn him as a Murderer, if convict by witneſſes, that he really did the dead, and both theſe relate to outward things, which can be proven by outward Teſtimonies; for without the certainty of the evidence, the Judge cannot pronounce his Sentence: But is a mans own confeſſing or affirming that he hath the true Marks of Faith, enough to prove he has them? and what are the Witneſſes, (to apply the examples of committing of Murder) by which a man ſhall know he has theſe Marks? and who ſhall examine the witneſſes? and judge of the certainty, and clearneſs of their Evidence? muſt it be the man that is accuſed? who uſeth that method? Anſ. 1. Both Doctrine and proof he hath learned from his old friend *Bellarmin*, who *de Cert. Juſt.* calleth the ſame Sophiſm *a Theological demonſtration*, contradicting not only the *Scriptures*, but divers of the *Papiſts* themſelves, as *Ameſius* ſheweth: *Bellarmin* alſo accounteth this Inſpiration of the *Quakers*, *the only way whereby a man can be firmlie aſſured of his having Faith*, or that *he ſhall have Salvation*. And therefore appropriateth it to *St. Francis*, and *St. Galla*, and the like, which dottage is ſufficiently refuted, exploded, and derided by *Ames*, and others, who have undertaken the Refutation of *Bellarmin*. Hence we may ſee, that if there be a *Jeſuit* more oppoſite to the *Reformed* than another, with him he joyneth hands,He is therefore to be accounted amongſt the groſſeſt of *Jeſuits*,and theſe his Romiſh Cavills are to be neglected, being an hundred times ſufficiently enervate by our *Divines* in their Writings againſt *Papiſts*, eſpecially in their anſwers to *Bellarmin*, out of whoſe Quiver he hath ſtollen this long ago blunted weapon. 2. The task incumbent to him was to evince, that it belongeth properly to the Rule of Faith ; to tell a Man. v. c. *John* or *James* in particular,that he hath true faith, whatever therefore he ſayeth beſides this, is beſides the purpoſe. But 3. *ex abundanti*, The bare and ſimple Profeſſion of *Quakeriſm* will no more prove one to be a *Quaker* in earneſt, than the ſimple Profeſſion that one hath Faith, will prove him to have it indeed ; Seeing a man may profeſs himſelf to be a *Quaker*, and yet be a *Jeſuit*, providing there be any difference between them: there is therefore more required , *viz*, that for any thing Men can know, ſuch a man liveth according to the principle of the partie, and no more is neceſſary for the begetting a Judgment of Charity, than that a man profeſs the principles of Chriſtianity, & Seriouſly, for any thing Men can know, practiſe accordingly; but no infallible Evidences that another hath true Faith, are any wayes neceſſarie ; but only Moral Rational Grounds of certainty, thoſe may be had; As for the other *viz.* infallible Evidences, thoſe are only neceſſar to ones ſelf, and theſe they may have by the *Scripture* applyed in Chriſtian prudence and Spiritual Wiſdom, the Scriptures themſelves being the Rule whereby to make the *Examen*, or

Search. *Iſ.* 8. 20. *Joh.* 5. 39. Act. 17. 11. 2. *Tim.* 3. 15. 16, 17. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. And the enlightned Conſcience, the Judge, the Spirit of Adoption, or a filial Diſpoſition, inclining the Believer to come to God; as a Child unto a Father, with both great Confidence, and Reverence, together with the renewed Spirit of the Believer himſelf. *Rom.* 8. 15, 16, the witneſſes. Hence his *antichriſtian* Cavills fall to the ground, and the ſimilies no more halt; the other Examples brought for the illuſtration of any Matter, for all ſimiles halt in ſome reſpect, otherwayes they ſhould not be ſimilies, but the ſame; and to think the ſimilies here uſed cannot hold, becauſe both Judge, & witneſſes, are inward in the matter, illuſtrated by theſe Similies, is not only without, but againſt Reaſon; For even as the one thing being outward, and to be proved to others, not to the Murderer himſelf, who knoweth it well enough, requireth an outward Judge, and outward witneſſes; So the other thing being inward, the infallible Teſtimony of which, the Perſon himſelf ſtandeth only in need of, requireth inward Judge, and inward Witneſſes,

7. The ſame *Author* hath another Objection proſecuted at large in his *Apologie*, and abbreviated in his *Abridgement*; falſly called his *Vindication*, *Pag.* 44. 45. which is, *that there are many things that the Scriptures cannot determine, as particular individual Actions*; to which *Mr: Broun* had anſwered, that *general Rules were enough, leaving the reſt to Chriſtian prudence, and Wiſdom, and alſo that there ſhould be need of a particular Revelation*

lation for every particular Action, as Eating, Drinking, &c. Yea every particular Word. This Conſequence he denyeth, ſaying, *that from Spiritual to Natural Actions, the neceſſity of this* Revelation *will not follow.* I anſwer firſt, The Conſequence which he denyed he proveth himſelf, for the Reaſon why Spiritual Actions need particular inſpirations, is becauſe of their being either Sin, or Duty, that they may know how to give *S*piritual Worſhip, and leave Carnal Worſhip, but this Reaſon he grants to ſtretch it ſelf to natural Actions, ſaying, *if he ſay, thoſe natural Acts under ſome Circumſtances may be ſin, or duty, I confeſs then the Revelation of the Spirit is needful.* Therefore if particular Immediate Revelations be neceſſary for the performances of Spiritual Actions, they are alſo neceſſary for the performance of Civil, or Natural Actions, ſeeing there is nothing more ſure, than that every individual Action is ſo Circumſtantiat as to become either Sin or Duty. 2. Who was ever ſo abſurd, and ridiculous as to deny that any Syſtem, as for example, of *Mathematicks*, or *Military Diſcipline*, is a perfect Rule to guide any Mathematician, or Souldier, upon this account, that thoſe Books comprehend not the Names of all Mathematicians, and Souldiers, that ever ſhould exiſt, with all their particular Actions, and the Circumſtances thereof? I am ſure that ſuch a one ſhould be eſteemed by all Men to have loſt his Wits: and yet no better than ſuch are the *Quakers Achillean Arguments.* Next he pleaſeth himſelf in reckoning up ſome differences amongſt Miniſters: As for example,

ample, thoſe called *Remonſtrants*, and *publick Reſolutioners*, and hence would infer the Inſufficiency of the *Scriptures*, for deciſion of Controverſies, and this he thinketh ſo ſtrong, that he requireth a particular anſwer to it, leaſt (*Sayeth he*) he, *viz.* Mr. *Brown* be ſaid to leap where he cannot ſtep. Anſ. If this do any thing it will overdo, ſeeing he dare not deny, that both *Paul & Barnabas* had immediat *Objective Revelations*, who notwithſtanding grew ſo hot in their Contention. Act. 15. that they parted one from another, of whoſe meeting again we hear not in all the Scriptures. But he labours ſo to fix that upon the Scriptures, with which the Corruption of men is only to be Charged, that he woundeth himſelf while he thruſteth at his Adverſary, ſeing if this Reaſon be Valid, *Objective Revelation* is no more a ſufficient Rule than the *Scriptures*: as this Inſtance of the diviſion of *Paul & Barnabas* evinceth. Beſide theſe, the *Quakers* have a heap of *Topicks*, to prove the Scriptures not a perfect Rule, ſuch as, *they cannot be a Rule to deaf perſons, therefore they cannot be a rule to thoſe that hear; and moſt men know not the Original Tongues.* Ergo ſay they, *the Scriptures cannot be a compleat Rule.* They object alſo, *the variety of Readings, Interpretations,* and the like, which they have ſcraped out of *Bellarmin* and his brethren, and therefore deſerve no more anſwer than what hath been given to them. *William* Pen in his *Rejoynder*, Part 1. *Chap.* 5. hath this Objection, the *Scriptures cannot try, and examine particular Motions, and Propheſies,* ſaying, that *Paul* Act. 16. *reproved*

proved not the Spirit of Divination, which poſſeſſed that Maid at Philippi, from the Scriptures; therefore they cannot be a Rule of Faith, and Life. But I deny the Antecedent, for had *James Nailor* but brought that particular Motion, whereby he was prompted to receive Divine Worſhip, to Scripture trial, he might have found his Spirit to have been *the father of lies*, and Arch-deceiver of Mankind: but as the *Papiſts* to cover the reſt of their abominations, have invented one greater, and more dangerous than them all, that is their *Churches infallibility*, So this *Spirit* of the *Quakers*, knowing that upon Tryal, he will be found a Counterfeit, hath taken the Councel given by *Alcibiades* to *Pericles*, that is, to ſtudy how he may ſecure himſelf from the hazard of a Trial. Hence theſe men are in all probability beyond the reach of a Conviction, but the many Inſtances, not only of other *Antiſcripturians*, but even of themſelves, who have been moſt pitifully and palpably acted by the Devil, whom they notwithſtanding took for God, might teach them at length, to ſuſpect their Spirit, and try before they truſt. As for the Propheſies of future Events, they may well be brought to the *Scripture Teſt*, to the end we may know whether the thing Propheſied may be expected, without contradicting the Scriptures; as for *Pauls* reproof of the Spirit of Divination, it is moſt irrationally Objected, Seeing *Paul* was immediatly Inſpired, and a Writer of Scripture himſelf. 2ly. This Action was moſt Conſonant to Scripture, being abundantly warranted by that promiſe of *Chriſt Matth:* 10, to his Apoſtles, that they ſhould caſt out Devils.

They uſe alſo many Arguments againſt the Scriptures being the principal Rule, of which the Chief and Ground of almoſt all the reſt (with which they ſtand and fall, and therefore meriteth particular Conſideration) is this, *the Scriptures are not the Fountain it ſelf, but a declaration of the Fountain; therefore they are not to be accounted the principal Original of all Truth, and Knowledge, nor the adequat* Primary *Rule of Faith and Manners*, thus reaſoned *Rob: Barclay* in his *Apology*. This conſequence is by his adverſary judged a Demonſtration of the *Authors* folly, *pag.* 57. as being altogether ridiculous, ſaying, *who ever dreamed that the Scriptures were God, or the Spirit of God?* To which *Ro: Barclay, Vind. pag.* 37. thus Replyeth, he ſayeth, " I come nearer " to the Core of my deſign, which is to ſet up Enthuſiaſms, in affirming, that the Scriptures are " not the Fountain, but a Declaration of the " Fountain, and yet the Man, within three or " four lines, confeſſeth it himſelf, aſcribing it to " my folly, to dream any man thinks ſo; (*thus he " goeth backward and forward*) which he illuſtrateth by the Example of Laws; But if it be ſo, " are not they to be blamed, that account them the " principal Original of all Truth and Knowledge? " whither the other branch of my deduction followeth from this: That they are not to be accounted the primary Rule of Faith and Manners, will " appear when the Arguments and Objections

“ relating to that,come particularly to be mentioned;
“ and whereas he thinks this is abſurd,and not
“ making for my Deſign,becauſe God Himſelf is the
“ Fountain, and yet not the Rule, he miſtakes the
“ matter as urged by me: For I argue, that the
“ Scriptures are not the Original Ground of
“ Knowledge, but God, not ſimply conſidered,
“ but as manifeſting himſelf in divine immediat Revelations
“ in the hearts of his children, which
“ being the new Covenants Diſpenſation, is the
“ primary and adequate Rule of Chriſtians: For
“ I was never ſo abſurd as to call God ſimply conſidered,
“ or the Spirit of God, (*in abſtracto*)
“ not as imprinting Truths to be believed, and obeyed
“ in mens hearts, not contrary but according
“ to Scripture (for he cannot contradict
“ himſelf) the Rule of Chriſtians, and this may
“ ſerve to anſwer all his Cavills upon this Theam.
“Thus he. Anſwer, in his *Apol.* he thus reaſoned,
“ the Scriptures are not the Fountain, but a Declaration
“ of the Fountain, therefore they are
“ not the principal original of all Truth, nor the adequate or primary Rule of Faith. Now this Argumentation, which is all one with, *fallacia plurium interrogationum*, hath a conſequent made up of two parts, and therefore there are to be conſidered here two conſequences, of which the firſt, or the conſequence as to the firſt part of the inference his adverſarie calleth *a demonſtration of the Authors folly*, as proving that which never man denyed, *viz.* that the Scriptures are not God himſelf: I add that this is alſo a demonſtration of his Malice, for in this his ridiculous argumentation he

would perſwade the world, that the Reformed Churches (for againſt them in that place he bendeth his weapons) aſſert, *that the Scriptures are God himſelf*: Upon this account I ſay his Adverſary accuſeth him of folly; now in ſtead of a better off-coming, he giveth out that his adverſary firſt denyed his Antecedent, and then again preſently confeſſed it; whereas he never impugned the Antecedent, but blameth him for his conſequence, of which (as we have already ſaid) the firſt part is very ridiculous, proving the thing that never one denyed; and malicious, belieing the whole Reformed Churches, and the ſecond part, *viz. Becauſe the Scriptures are not the Fountain, therefore they are not the adequat and primary Rule of Faith, a Rope of ſand*. The coherence of which will be made out *ad Calendas Græcas*. He ſayeth, that the ſecond Branch of his Deduction will appear, when the Arguments, and objections relating to that, come particularly to be mentioned, which is nothing to the purpoſe in hand; for unleſs he prove, that the Scriptures are not the primary and adequate Rule of Faith from this one Topick, that they are not the Fountain, but a Declaration thereof, the argument is gone. Hence all this wrangling is but a further proof of his Weakneſs and Malice. In his following Words, he confoundeth the *Principal Rule*, and the *Original Ground* together, which are things moſt diſtinct; and therefore theſe words are altogether void of good ſenſe, or at beſt they are ridiculous, in that they ſpeak nothing to the purpoſe: For he might well have known, if he had pleaſed, that by *the Primary Rule*, is underſtood that which is now among the hands of Chriſtians, according to which they ought to examine ultimately all ſort of Doctrines, and opinions of men, or yet ſuggeſtions from within concerning divine things, and reject, or receive as they diſagree, or agree with this Rule. If in this ſenſe, he had underſtood *the primary* Rule, he had not given ſuch myſterious Niceties. But the Queſtion is not, if *God* be greater than the Scriptures? for as man is above the word of a man, ſo is he above them; But the Queſtion is, whether or not the Scriptures contain all things neceſſary in order to Faith, and practiſe, and whether or not we ought to ſee that every Doctrine we embrace be according to them? and if ſwerving from them we onght to reject it, tho an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach it? Thus we underſtand the primary Rule; and while he doth not ſo, he but miſtaketh the Queſtion. 2. This Acyrology, or improper ſpeech, to call a perſon a Rule, is a grand inductive of Confuſion, for who ever called a teacher a Rule, for only the dictats taught are the Rule. Here we ſee that theſe new Teachers are contrary to all men, in their acceptations of Words as well as in Doctrines. But whereas he ſayeth, *that he was never ſo abſurd as to call the Spirit of God, ſimply, or* in abſtracto *a Rule, but as he imprints Truths in the hearts of Believers*, he doth not anſwer theſe things which he calls Cavills; for theſe *Rules imprinted in the Soul*, are not God, under what notion ſoever he be taken: a Declaration of the Fountain,

tain, is not the fountain it ſelf. Hence the Quakers grand principle that *immediat objective Revelations*, are the primary Rule of their Faith, falleth to the Ground, and theſe imprinted Rules are but only ſecondary : *Ergo* even according to what is here gained from the Quakers, the Scriptures are equal even in their primarineſs, to immediat Revelations, for the one can no more be called the primary Rule, than the other, and that by the Quaker his own Conceſſion. Moreover ſeing theſe *immediat Revelations*, imprinted on the Soul, are not the primary but ſecondary Rule, then certainly they ought to be examined according to the primary Rule. Now to aſſert this is moſt impious : Seing theſe Revelations muſt be ſuppoſed to be ſelf evident, and their Divinity already undoubtedly apparent. For this is to maintain that we ought to doubt whether or not there is veracity in God, and (*horreſco referens*) Judge, that the God of Truth may prove the lyar, and deceive us. But once more, how ſhal theſe imprinted ſecondary Rules be examined! not by other words or dictates of whatſoever kind, for to do this will coſt the examiner a journey to *in finitum*, to which he will not come in haſte, ſeing theſe other Dictats or Revelations are not the Fountain, but a Declaration of the Fountain, more than the firſt; and to aſſert, *that theſe Revelations may be examined according to God himſelf, and not by the Word of God*, is to go ſome ſtages beyond the wildeſt of nonſenſe, and again there is very good Reaſon to wonder, why any Revelation ſhould be more primary than the

Scriptures, both being given by the ſame Spirit, ſeing the primarineſſe is not the immediatneſs, but the chief binding power,& the prerogative to be the touch-ſtone of all Doctrines. Now this notion of a primary Rule being had, there is very good Reaſon to wonder, why the Dictats of the Spirit ſhould be preferred before the Scriptures, ſeing God hath told, (whether mediatly or immediatly, it's all one: the Quakers themſelves dare not deny that God hath indeed ſaid it) that they are *able to make the Man of God wiſe unto ſalvation* 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. And hath commanded, and commended the peruſal of them, as the Book in the determination of which we ought finally, and ſurely to reſt, in the matters of greateſt import, *Iſai.* 8. 20. *Joh.* 5. 39. *Act.* 17. 11. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. With many other places. But on the other hand in all the Scriptures there is not ſo much as the leaſt intimation that all perſons within the Church, and far leſs all men, have *divine immediat, Objective Revelations*, by which they may examine, and diſcern good from evil, and here he is very angry with his adverſary, becauſe he accuſed him of confounding in his Apology, the *principal Rule*, and the *principal Leader*, and yet as though he had not confounded them compleatly enough in his *Apology*, he here again in his *Vindication* in one and the ſame page *viz.* 38. both calleth the Spirit, as imprinting Truths into the Soul, the *primary Rule*, as was even now cited: and alſo the ſame Spirit the *principal Leader*, as imprinting Rules into the Soul, to walk by, by which Rules muſt be underſtood the Truths he ſpake of juſt now above;

here the Reader may ſee, that not only the ſame thing is both *Principal Leader*, and *principal Rule*, but alſo that there is not ſo much as a *Metaphyſical* formality betwixt them, for both of them is God under the notion of imprinting Rules or Truths, into the ſoul, yet the confidence (I ſhal not ſay the impudence) hath he to deny that he confounded them.

8. But the Quakers well knowing, that if God ſpeaking in the Holy Scriptures, be admitted Judge of the preſent *Debates* between us and them, Or if the Holy Scriptures be not Eſteemed Falſe, Ambiguous, and Nonſenſical, then their cauſe is loſt, and their great *Diana* of Immediat Revelations, and the reſt of their Monſtruous, and Impious Doctrine falls to the ground, they aſſert with the *Papiſts*, *that the Spirit of God Speaking in the Scriptures is not his own Interpreter*, and ſo bereave the Scriptures of that which is the Soul, Senſe, and Marrow thereof, denying all Scripture Interpretation, though never ſo Genuine and Clear, except they have Immediat Objective Revelation, to tell them that ſuch a Meaning is true: Hence they ſay, *they may very well reject all our Interpretations, and Conſequences of Scripture, ſeeing we do not pretend to the Spirit that gave forth the Scripture, but declare our ſelves Enemies to it:* Thus replyeth *George Keith* to Mr. *John Alexander*. *Truths Def. Chap.* 8. Behold, Reader, the groſſeſt of Popiſh Shifts! to defend the groſſeſt of Popiſh Doctrine; for the *Papiſts* ſtill ſay, that we can know nothing Certainly, becauſe we reject their Doctrine of Infallibility, & juſt ſo do the

Quakers, maliciouſly belying the whole Reformed Churches, Impiouſly crying out that they are Enemies to the Spirit of God, and that becauſe we examine all Doctrines and Practices by the written Word of God. Hence we find that the Spirit the *Quakers* pretend to, is Diametrically oppoſite to the Scriptures, and therefore the *Spirit* of *Lies*, and Deluſion; at this they are enraged, and cannot away with it, *Nam trepidant immiſſo lumine manes.* Hence *William Pen* thus ſpeaketh, *Rej. Pag.* 72. *Let them ſhew me that Scripture, that plainly and uninterpretatly tells me ſuch a propoſition is true, and ſuch a One is falſe, that only conſiſts of their additional* Meanings; *ſuch a new Nick-named People Right, and ſuch wrong, and they do their buſines; If they cannot, as it is impoſſible they ſhould, they muſt have recourſe to ſome thing elſe to Rule, and Determine, and What can that be beſides that Eternal Spirit.* Thou ſeeſt, Judicious Reader, that according to the *Quakers*, God ſpeaking in the Scriptures cannot tell us what is true, or what is falſe, who are Right, or who are Wrong; of the ſame Nature is that which the Quakers have in their *Queries* to Mr. *John Alexander*, in which they often require an Anſwer to be given in plain words of Scripture, and in particular *Querie* 10. They have theſe Words, *We* (ſay they) expect plain *Scriptures from you for this, without any Shuffling, Meanings, Conſequences, or elſe never pretend Scripture* Rule *more; but acknowledge that it hath been your Meanings, & Conſequences which have been your Rule*; Hence according to this Doctrine our Saviour laboured but in vain, when he proved the reſurrection of the Dead from the Scriptures; *Matth.* 22. 31, 32. for the *Sadducees* might have anſwered, that ſuch expreſs words were not in the *Pentateuch*, viz. *That the dead ſhould riſe again*, and therefore they were not bound to believe it, tho the inference were never ſo clear, except they had a new immediate Revelation, which they might have ſaid we have not, and who could have proved the contrary; yea, if this Doctrine be true, a man doth not ſin, tho he worſhip the *Crocodile*, *Ibis*, *Dog* or *Cat* with the old *Egyptians*; yea, a man may believe, or do whatever cometh into his brain, for no where in the Scripture is any man in particular, as for Example, R*obert*, *Anthonie*, or *Chriſtopher* forbidden, or commanded to do any thing. According to this principle alſo, they deny all Means, and helps for expounding of the Scriptures, all Commentaries and Expoſitions, witneſs amongſt others theſe words of *Geo*: *Fox* in his Primmar to *Europe*. Pag. 37. *What are the Means of ſearching out the meaning of the Scriptures? one whereof you ſay is a Logical Analyſis, and what is a Logical Analyſis of the Scriptures?* and Robert B. *Vind.* Pag. 29. Impiouſly denyeth, that the *Holy Ghoſt is a Diſtinct Perſon of the Trinity*, and that upon this ground, becauſe as he ſayeth, *theſe Words are not found expreſly in Scripture*; The ſame way *Rob: B.* in his *Apology* underſtandeth that place 1 *John*. 2. 27. ῥητῶς, or as the words at the firſt ſound, and without any explication, or clearing of them, argumenteth from them; *He that hath an Anointing abiding in him, teaching*

ing him all things, ſo that he needs no man to teach him, hath an inward and immediat Teacher, and hath ſome things inwardly, and immediatly revealed unto him. The ſame way alſo he underſtandeth and expoundeth Jer. 31. 34. So that whatever they ſay, or can ſay, to liberate their Doctrine of this moſt weightie, but juſt Charge, they ſhall only twiſt Contradictions the faſter. And ſuitable to this Doctrine is the Practice of *Quakers*, who notwithſtanding that they Endeavour to perſwade the World, that they are Illuminat, as the Prophets and Apoſtles were, yea, if not more; have never yet, for any thing I can learn, benefited the Church by commenting upon any one Book of Scripture, but account all Commentaries and ſuch Treaties uſeleſs, and unworthy, except by detorting of them, to find out ſome thing oppoſite to the Doctrine of the *Reformed Churches*. Now certainly if theſe men be ſo Illuminat, as they would bear us in hand, there can be no reaſon Alledged, whey they benefit not the World, by illuſtrating the Scriptures, with clear Commentaries, and ſuch Helps as may be moſt uſeful for underſtanding thereof, if it be not that they either Envy the World of ſuch a Good, which I think they will not ſay, Or elſe that all ſuch Helps are ſuperfluous. And indeed this they ſtick not to ſay, publiſhing to the World in Print, that all Catechetical Doctrine & Inſtruction is the Doctrine of *Antichriſt*, & learned from *Papiſts*; yea the very *Scriptures* themſelves they call by way of Detraction the *Letter inky Divinity*, & worſe. Add to all this, their Doctrine of *ſilent waiting*, their railing againſt ſtudied Sermons, and explications of Scripture. And that in all their *Pamphlets* they uſe not to exhort men to ſearch the Scriptures, according to the Example of Chriſt Jeſus; but in ſtead thereof, the Light within. Theſe and many other things which might be ſaid, ſufficiently evince, that this their Revelation or new *Light*, is unto them in place of Commentaries, Catechiſms, or any other Helps for underſtanding the Scriptures; yea and the Scriptures themſelves: So that this one Darling of theirs, renders all others needleſs: Moreover, they deny with the old *Manichees*, that any part of the old Teſtament is binding upon us, and as for the N. T. *William Pen* ſaith, that the far greater part thereof is altogether loſt, and ſticketh not to ſay, that without their Spirit, we have no more certainty of the *Scriptures* than of the *Popiſh* Legends. Add to all this, that this Doctrine of the Quakers, viz. *That the Scriptures are not the principal Rule of Faith, and manners*, or chief Judge of Controverſies, is downright Popiſh, and (as good reaſon they ſhould be) both their Arguments to prove it, and their Anſwers to our Arguments againſt it, altogether Coincide with thoſe of the *Romaniſts*, which might eaſily be illuſtrat in every particular; Some Examples we have given already, to thoſe we may ad one other *viz. Rev.* 22. 18. From which place we uſually reaſon, that the *Canon* of the Scriptures is compleated; to which place the *Papiſts* anſwer, that this prohibition is only to be underſtood of the book of the *Revelation* alone, and that it will no more follow from this place, that *Traditions*

ought

ought not to be added to the *Scriptures*, as a part of the rule of Faith and Manners, then it will follow from *Deut.* 4. 2. That the Prophets and Apoſtles were to write no *Scriptures* afterward; To this purpoſe may *Bellarmin* anſwer and the reſt of the Jeſuites. The ſame way directly anſwereth *Robert Barclay* (as theſe may do with the like ſupport of their cauſe) both in his *Apologie*, and *Vindication*; and when *Mr. Broun* telleth him, that this as all the reſt is a Popiſh ſhift; He replies *Vind.* pag. 35. in theſe words, what then, I could tell him an hundred Arguments uſed by him, which the Papiſts alſo uſe againſt us; will he ſay it follows they are invalid. But how pitiful and ſhameful this ſhift is, none ſee not; for can he ſay, that his Adverſary had an hundred Arguments common to him with *Papiſts*, tending to the overthrow of the Doctrine of the reformed Churches, which they hold in oppoſition to *papiſts*, either this he muſt ſay, otherwayes he only diſcovereth a deſperate Cauſe, and an Effronted Defender; For certainly there are Arguments common to both us and the *Papiſts*, by which we defend the Truth of the *Chriſtian Religion* in oppoſition to *Heathens*, and *Jews*, yet none except he that is altogether careleſs of what he ſays, or that mindeth to infer *Quidlibet ex quolibet* (as they ſay) will affirm, that *Proteſtants* are *Papiſts*, or *Papiſts Proteſtants* upon that account. Hence it is clear, that as there is not the leaſt ſhadow of a Difference between *Papiſts* and *Quakers* in this point, ſo this *Quaker* is conſcious of it, ſeeing, he could not but know that if this ſhift did him any Service, to diſtinguiſh him from a *Papiſt*, It will no leſs diſtinguiſh a *Papiſt* from himſelf, and prove him to be no *Papiſt*; So we ſee that the very ſhifts that theſe men uſe, under the covert of which they may Lurk, contribut only to the more clear Detection and Diſcovery of their wickedneſs, in promoting what they can this downright *Popiſh* Doctrine, and groſs Hypocriſie, in refuſing the Name, when they cannot but know that they are guilty of the thing.

CHAP. II.

Of Immediate Revelation.

AS the *Quakers* have rejected the guidance of the Spirit of God, ſpeaking in the Holy Scriptures, which are *able to make the Man of God wiſe unto Salvation*; ſo they have moſt impiouſly and ſelf-deceivingly given up themſelves to the guidance of ſomething, which they call the *Spirit of God*, as we have heard: and again in contradiction to this, *the Soul of Chriſt extended and dilated*, of which, ſay they, every man is a partaker. But moſt frequently they call it, the *Light* within, or ſimply, the *Spirit*, which they make the chief and principal Rule of Faith, and manners, to which *Spirit* God himſelf ſpeaking in the Holy Scripture muſt do obeiſance. Which Doctrine although we have already

ready everted in the former chapter, we ſhal notwithſtanding here propoſe and vindicate a few Arguments for the further overthrow thereof, and detection of the groſſe abomination and horrid deluſion attending their principles, And firſt I will propoſe and vindicate an Argument propoſed by *Mr. Brown; Quakeriſm the plain way to Paganiſm* pag. 46. Which Argument *Robert Barclay* attempteth to ſolve *Vind:* pag. 17. which is this,

If ſince the Apoſtles fell aſleep, and the Canon of the Scriptures was cloſed, all that have pretended to immediate Revelation, as a primary Rule, have been led by a Spirit of error, then it is not the way of Chriſt

But the former is true.

Ergo, &c.

To this he anſwers 1. *that Mr. Brown begs the Queſtion, in his preſuppoſing, that there are no Apoſtles now, and that the Canon of the Scriptures is cloſed*; againſt which exception I reaſſume the Argument thus.

If ſince the Apoſtles, whoſe Names are mentioned in Scripture, fell aſleep, and *John* wrote the Revelation, all that pretended to this kind of Revelation have been led by a Spirit of error, then this is not the way of Chriſt;

But the former is true.

Ergo, &c.

There can now no exception be made againſt the Major, for none will deny, that the Apoſtles whoſe names are mentioned in Scripture are dead, and that *John* hath written the Revelation, and well enough he knew that Mr. *Brown* underſtood no other thing than what we have now ſaid, and yet ſo covetous hath he been of ſhifting, that he behoved to have one, though he could not but know that it would ſerve no longer than it met with an impugner. I now come to his anſwer to the Minor, which Mr. *Brown* makes evident by an induction of many *Sects, and Hereticks*, pretending to immediate Revelation, all which are known and not denyed by *Quakers*, to have been led by a Spirit of error, to which we may add many of the Quakers themſelves, ſuch as *Ja: Nailor*, *Suſanna Parſons*; who as *Paget* relateth, being moved by this lying Spirit, fruitleſly attempted to raiſe from the dead, another of the *Quakers*, one *William Pool* by name, who had murdered himſelf, and *Gilpins*, of whoſe lying Spirit ſee at large in *Clerks Examples*; alſo *John Toldervy*, of whom ſee a little Book called, *foot out of ſnare*; *Robert Churchman* and many others, of whom you may read at large in *Mr. Increaſe Maithers* Book. And he requireth an inſtance of the contrary, which is the only way to anſwer an Induction; In ſtead of which he ſayeth, that he is bound to prove, that there was never one pretending to immediate Revelation, but he was alſo led of the Spirit of error, which he hath done until he give an inſtance to the contrary: or elſe ſhew another way of anſwering an induction, which will be new logick; which perhaps he may do, for he and his Brethren are very diſpleaſed with the old. 2*ly*. That he may not be alone in this ſore ſtreſſe, he ſaith that *Mr Menzies*

zies doth thus anſwer *Dempſter* the Jeſuite: which is an impudent falſhood, for neither the Jeſuits *medium* nor probation of his Minor, is in the leaſt like the Argument which we now vindicate; for the Jeſuits Argument was this, *That Religion cannot be true Religion which hath no peculiar ground, or principle to prove that it is a Religion, and conform to the true ſenſe and letter of the Scripture, or Word of God*; and *he ſubſumes, But the Proteſtant Religion hath no peculiar ground*, &c. *Ergo it cannot be a true Religion.* Hence it is evident that theſe two Argumentations have nothing of conſanguinity; For if theſe two Argumentations had ſtricken alike at the two parties, againſt which they were framed, then the Jeſuits Argument ſhould have run thus; Whoſoever ſince the Apoſtles fell aſleep have pretended to, or pleaded for the Scriptures as their principal Rule, have fallen into palpable errors and open blaſphemy, ſo that they became marks of Gods heavy judgment. Now where ſhould the Jeſuite have found ſuch a long Catalogue of theſe, as *Mr. Brown* hath found of deluded *Enthuſiaſts.* But which is the main thing and quite refutes the moſt falſly and impiouſly alledged coincidence of theſe Arguments, how eaſy ſhould it have been to have adduced not only one inſtance to the contrary, but whole volums thereof, yea not only the whole *primitive Church* for diverſe *Centuries* after Chriſt, and all the *Reformed Churches*, both theſe whom men are pleaſed to call *Calviniſts*, and *Lutherans*, together with the *Greek*, and *Abaſſine Churches*; But likewiſe the

the moſt grave, wiſe and learned of the *Romaniſts* themſelves. By this time I hope this arch-falſhood of the *Quaker*, whereby he would hide the ſhame of his deſperat cauſe, already appeareth; again I anſwer directly to the Jeſuit, and the Quaker his patron, that if we may believe the ableſt, and fierceſt of our Adverſaries, ſuch as *Bellarmin*, *Contaren*, *Salmeron*, the chief of the Doctrines, which we hold in oppoſition to popery are moſt agreeable to the true Senſe of Scripture.

His third anſwer is, that *ſome of the primitive Proteſtants, ſuch as George Wiſhart* and *John Huſs had immediat Revelation*, But, *nequiſquam Ajacem poſſit ſuperare niſi Ajax*, that he might be ſure no other ſhould refute him, he refuteth himſelf, and rendereth his inſtance altogether unſerviceable, by granting they *did not pretend to it as the ground of their Faith, and obedience in all matters of doctrine and worſhip*? Laſtly to the inſtance of *Ja: Naylor*, they anſwer, that *he repented again*; which anſwer is an evident confirmation of what we plead for, *viz*. that the *Quakers* Spirit is ready to give them the cheat, and deceive them, for *I* believe *Ja: Naylor* acted but according to his light when he received *Divine Worſhip*. From this argument we may obſerve theſe things *firſt*, if it hold as cogent, this is a ſerious Truth which he ſayeth. *Vindic*. page. 25. is abſurdly affirmed by *James Durham* (as he ſpeaks) *viz*. that Chriſt ſpake his *laſt words to the Church*, that is, put a cloſe to theſe writings which were to be a Rule to the whole Church; for if all that pretend the like commiſſion, or ſuch immediate Revelation of the rule of their Faith (about which the queſtion is) were led by a *Spirit* of error, then the Revelation was the laſt Scripture written, and ſure, for any thing he knoweth, ought to be written, there is no reaſon to believe that there is any more to be written. 2*ly*. Obſerve, that this *Argument* is demonſtrative, for ſuch are all inductions which have no inſtance to the contrary. 3*ly*. It deſtroyes wholly the *Quakers* cauſe; for this kind of Revelation being diſproved, the very *proprium quarti modi* of the *Quakers* is deſtroyed.

2dly. *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles*, and all the holy men that were inſpired by God, to compile a rule of Faith, and Life, could by Infallible Evidence, and infallible proofs, even to the Conviction, and ſelf Condemnation of the greateſt Oppoſers, demonſtrat, that they were ſent of God, but nothing of this kind the *Quakers* can do; yea, they are ſo far from it, that they can bring no more Evidence, or Credentials for their Rule of Faith, or pretended Revelation, than the moſt wicked *Enthuſiaſts*, as for Example *John* of *Leyden* and his followers, whom the *Quakers* themſelves dare not deny to have him Acted by a moſt wicked Spirit of Deluſion; ſeeing therefore, they will not ſubject their Revelations to the infallible teſt of the holy Scriptures, but contrarywiſe will Impiouſly make the Scriptures ſtoup to their Revelations, they can be no more certain, that they are not acted by the Devil, or at leaſt by their own giddy-brain, and erroneous fancie, when they bear us in hand, that they are inſpired by the Spirit of God, than they of *Munſter* were. To this Argument they decline ſo far as they can a direct anſwer; Therefore, Robert *Barclay* Replyeth to Mr. Broun. *Vind.* pag. 21. *How cometh it that others pretending to be led by the Scripture as their Rule, as much as* John Broun *have been deceived, ſince the Scripture declares nothing but* Truth; But *how ſilly this is I have ſhown above and more largely in my Apology in theſe paragraphs which I obſerved he moſt foully omitted. And indeed this is a fine Argument, he has provided for Atheiſts, and Scepticks, for it renders all Faith, even that of the* Patriarchs *uncertain*: For *ſince their ground, and warrant of Writing the Scripture, was in his own account Inward, Immediat and Extraordinary Revelations, and if ſuch be, as he affirms, uncertain, then the truth of the Scriptures which depends upon ſuch, muſt neceſſarily be uncertain, ſince the Stream cannot be more pure than the Fountain.* Thus he; This Reply reſolveth into two Hypothetick Propoſitions (as for the Paragraphs of which he here boaſteth as unanſwered, which take up ſix pages in his Apology, filled with Railing and Gall, againſt all the reformed Churches, they prove only that the Scriptures through men corruption are ſubject to abuſe, which never man denyed.) The firſt is, if the Scriptures through the Corruption of men, may be wreſted and abuſed to the Patrociny of Errors and corrupt Practices, then altho men clearly underſtand, and firmly believe them, and ſquare their Practice exactly according to them; Yet they are no more able to be a Rule unto them, than theſe Revelations can be which *John* of *Leyden* held. The ſecond is, He that will not admit of ſuch Revelations as cannot be diſtinguiſhed from theſe which led their followers into the moſt Blaſphemous Opinions, and moſt wicked Practices imaginable, He (I ſay) that will not admit of theſe for his principal Rule, but preferreth unto them the *Scriptures*, which can both be invincibly demonſtrated to have proceeded from God, and alſo call themſelves ſufficient to make one wiſe unto Salvation, provideth an Argument for *Atheiſts* and *Scepticks*: But thus doth *Mr. Broun* reaſon againſt the *Quakers*, and except this & the like other grounds, the *Quakers* have none for this heavy Charge. For that his Adverſary called the Revelations of the Apoſtles & Prophets uncertain; Is a moſt palpable Untruth, the leaſt ſhadow of which cannot be found in all his Writings, except they deduce it by ſuch unreaſonable Inferences as theſe. And now, Reader, ſpeak thy mind in good earneſt; Thinkeſt thou that this man was in his wit, or to be numbred amongſt Rationals, when he made theſe Deductions, by which their palpable *Impieties* are indeed antidots againſt ſeduction. But theſe men have an ordinary Trick of comparing their own Revelations, of the Divinity of which they can give no Signs, to theſe of the Apoſtles, and Prophets, that were to the conviction of all Oppoſers, proved to be *Divine*; and thus give away, and betray the Chriſtian Cauſe; in labouring to defend their own Dottages. In the next place therefore, let us take a ſhort view of the *Quakers principal* Rule, compared with ours, that it may more fully appear, which of the parties provide an argument for *Atheiſts* & *Scepticks*; And 1. We cannot know whether they have any Revelations at all, they may be lying unto us for any thing we know, we have only their naked Word for it; whereas on the other hand, it is beyond denyal that we have the Scriptures. 2ly. It being given that they have Revelations of ſome kind, from whence are they? from Heaven? their own fancy? or from Hell? This we cannot know, they neither do, nor can give any mark to diſtinguiſh them from theſe Revelations, which all the world are perſwaded to have been from Hell, or at leaſt from a Vertiginous Fancy. Go to then, let them ſpeak their mind, and attempt the retortion of the argument (if they dare) upon the Scriptures. They yet more fully prove, that their Revelations are not from Heaven, while they affirm that they are common to all men, which (if the experience of the World, yea, of the word of God may be judge) is moſt falſe. 3ly, Making a Suppoſition, which will never come to a ſolid Poſition, that they have divine Revelations, we yet cannot know for what end they are given; whether to be a principal Rule or not, or whether or not through their own corruption, they do not wreſt and miſunderſtand, or tho they do underſtand them, if they walk according to them (nothing of which can be ſaid of the Scriptures) we can hear nothing, nor ſee nothing, but ſome men ſtill amuſing the World, Crying a new *Light*, without giving any Evidence or proof thereof, but only their own Word, & ſo are always their own witneſſes in their own cauſe, and therefore by all rational men ought not a little to be ſuſpected. 4ly. This Spirit, inward Light, or *Revelations* of the *Quakers*, for I take all for one, can never be able to determine Controverſies; Seeing two different parties may both of them adduce theſe *Revelations* to prove contradictory Aſſertions. Now Seeing neither of the parties, is in caſe to Evince that his *Revelations* are from God more than the other, the Controverſie muſt remain for ever undetermined, Seeing they have no common principle in which they can concenter and meet. And thus ſtandeth (for Examples ſake) the caſe betwixt *Quakers* and *Ranters*, agreeing in this principle of immediat *Revelations*, and yet (if their books be to be believed) bitter Enemies to one another in ſeveral points, for which both of them alledge *Revelations* as their grand Principle, and neither of them can evince thei Revelations to have proceeded from God, mor than the other. Hence we moſt rationally conclud that the Controverſies betwixt theſe two partie are indeterminable, ſo long as they ſtick to thi Principle. Now this Argument in no ways ca be retorted on the Scriptures, for though there hav been through the corruption of men, wreſting t Scriptures, many Controverſies, and that even a mongſt theſe who aſſert that the Scriptures a the Principal Rule of Faith, and Manners; yet wh

ſt

can ſay, that this is through default of the Scriptures, ſeeing our Adverſaries cannot deny, but that they ſpeak both Senſe and Truth; and that when there is a real Contradiction between two, diſputing cocerning any Doctrine, or Senſe, and meaning of any text of Scripture, this Text ſpeaks for the one, and againſt the other, tho the one of the parties, either through Ignorance cannot, or through prejudice will not ſee it; and that the ſenſe thereof may be brought forth to the light, ſo that there ſhall follow a mutual Agreement between the two diſſenting parties, and conſequently that the Scriptures of their own Nature, are apt for the removal of differences about things contained in them. We have heard their retortion, let us now hear their direct anſwer, which is, that *their fruits declare them to have the Spirit of God*; Thus its anſwered in their *Quakeriſm confirmed*, to the Students of *Aberdeen*; For which forſooth they bring Scripture proof from *Matth.* 7. 15, 16. where fruits are made the Teſt for trying whether one be a true or falſe Prophet. But what fruits theſe thorny prickling Plants have brought, and do daily bring forth, the world is not ignorant. If to deny the Holy Trinitie, the P*erſon* of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the reſurrection of the Body, and to aſſert the Souls of men, yea and devils to, to be *God Almighty*, (of which abominations we ſhall ere we end this Treatiſe, undeniably prove the *Quakers* to be guilty) and in a word, to vomit out their Malice, ſo as to endeavour the overthrow of whatſoever God in his Sacred Word hath commanded us, either to believe

or

or do. If theſe (I ſay) be the fruits of the Spirit ? then indeed the *Quakers* have them, and abound in them, and other Fruits we know none, except (which are of little worth) ſome *Stoiciſms*, and ridiculous whimſies, in which alſo ſome of the *Mahumetan* and other *Monks* have gone far beyond them; yea, with theſe men, Envy, Pride, Contempt of all others, are ſo predominant, that tho by this Character only, it is eaſily judged by what Spirit they are acted. Add to all this, their conſtant cuſtome of horrible lying, Perverting, and Railing; of which take one or two Inſtances in the practiſe of one of their chief leaders *Rob* : *Barcl.* for *Vind.* pag. 60 He ſayeth, *that his Adverſarie inferred from the Quakers Doctrine of Chriſts dying for all, that* I*nfants come to heaven without Chriſt* ; But how groſſe an untruth is this, will be evident to any that read *Mr.* Broun, Cap 6. Num. 14. where he inferreth this horrible conſequence, from their denying of Original Sin; and again *pag* 64. 65. he ſaith, that the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion ſaith, that God did predeſtinat to everlaſting damnation the moſt part of men, without any reſpect had to their ſin*; But a more palpable and horrid lie, hath ſcarce been hatched; for in that *Confeſſion* chap 3. §. 7. It is expreſly ſaid, that *God did ordain them to Wrath for their ſins.* Of the like nature, is that which he ſaith pag. 170; *That his Adverſary chap* 27. *maketh a* Preaching *to the Devil*, *and that a Miniſter at* Li*gerwood, made a* Pray*er to the Devil*; whereas he only inferreth from the Q*uakers* Doctrine, that they may make a Preaching to the Devil. And as for Railing, their whole writings are Stuffed with it, See for example *Hubberthorn* againſt *Sherlock*, whoſe whole Pamphlet, is nothing but an heap of furious Railing, his beſt Language being, *Thief, rude Fellow, Enemy to God* &c. See alſo Edward Burroughs in anſwer to *Philip Bennet*, whoſe beſt language is *Serpent, the lake is prepared for thee*, and ſuch language as this is the marrow of the *Quakers* refutation of their adverſaries Books. For in theſe two now Named Diſcourſes, there is hardly the ſhadow of ſo much as an Eſſay to anſwer; But this is the way how they gain the day, and obtain the laſt word. How fair an occaſion is here offered to ſhew to the world by a particular Enumeration of their horrid & monſtruous practices that their fruits are the Grapes of *Sodom*, and the wine of *Gomorrah*; But they are but too too well known already; we forbear therefore to rake into this Dung-hill, Certain it is that the works of the Angel of the bottomleſs pit, will as ſoon prove himſelf to be an angel of Light, as the Fruits of theſe High-pretenders, will prove them to be acted by the Spirit of God.

But more fully to confirm or rather illuſtrate this argument *I* ſhal ſhew the Identity of their Spirit with that of the old *Anabaptiſts* in ſeveral particulars.

A ſhort parallel between the old Libertine Anabaptiſts, and the new, who are known by the name of Quakers.

1. *Muncer* and the *Anabaptiſts* with him denyed that the Scriptures, or external word (for

thus they ſpake that they might the better vilify the Scriptures were the Word of God, but only a Teſtimony thereof; and ſaid that the *Word of God was a certain heavenly thing diſtinct from the Scriptures.* Bullinger *adverſus Anabaptiſtas* lib. 1, cap. 1. The ſame is the downright Doctrine of the *Quakers*; only there is this difference, that the *Quakers* expreſſe themſelves in this matter with more rage and fury, than (for ought I can find) the *Anabaptiſts* did, as the Reader may may ſee cap. 1. §. 1. of this Treatiſe.

2dly. *Muncer* with his diſciples preferred that which they called immediate Revelation and inſpirations, (busked with the ſpecious Title of Fathers will, as the Quakers Revelations are now with that of the Spirit) to Gods written Word. *Bullinger* Ibid and cap. 2. & *paſſim alibi.* Sleidan; comm: Calvin: *Inſtit:* lib, 1 cap. 9. In this point alſo the Quakers are their ſucceſſors, or rather the ſame, the name being changed, ſeing they with Robert *Barclay* propoſ. 2, 3. aſſert, that *not the Scriptures, but the Spirit, is the principal Rule of* Faith *and Manners.*

3dly. The old *Anabaptiſts* aſſerted, that the *expreſs Words and Phraſes of the* Scriptures *are to be adhered to, without any expoſition, interpretation or deduction.* Bulling: lib. 1. cap. 8. & *alibi.* In this alſo their genuine children the *Quakers* follow them with both feet, as is evident in this Treatiſe cap. 1.

4ly. The Anabaptiſts of old aſſerted that the *whole Old Teſtament is now abrogate, and pertaineth*

taineth not to a Chriſtian, nor hath any obligation or force upon him, in which wicked Doctrine as they followed the *Manicheans*, ſo at this day the no leſſe wicked *Quakers* follow them, aſſerting *that nothing recorded in the old Teſtament is binding and incumbent to us, but as it is ratified by Chriſt in the new, and hath precept or Authority from it, as is affirmed by* Robert Barclay Vindic: P. 178. num. 5. Hence it is evident that according to them, no part of the Old Teſtament is more obligatory or binding upon us, than the words of *Aratus*, or ſuch heathen Poets are, and yet theſe men will not ſtick in contradiction to theſe their own words to ſay, we calumniat them. If we draw from this or the like paſſages that they deny the Authority of the Old Teſtament, R*obert Barclay Ibidem.*

5ly. Both *A*nabaptiſts and Quakers deny *Original Sin*; for proof of which ſee cap. 3. of this Treatiſe.

6ly. The *A*nabaptiſts, Muncer and the reſt of his ſect taught, *that Chriſt made no Satisfaction for ſins: and compared theſe who taught the contrary to the rable of Scribes and* Phariſees. Bulling. lib. 1. cap. 11. they taught alſo *that its damnable and dangerous Doctrine, to aſſert that we are juſtified by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or by Faith, and not alſo by Works*, Bulling lib. 4. cap. 1. *& Sequ.* In which Doctrine the *Quakers* have not only equalized but outdone and outſtript their *Anceſtors*, as cap 5. of this Treatiſe more abundantly evinceth; and here it is to be obſerved once for all that all the Capital adverſaries of the Chriſtian Religion, how contrary ſoever they may be or ſeem to be one to another: ſymbolize in this grand *hereſy*, and conſpire together the overthrow, and ſubverſion of the Doctrine of *Juſtification by Faith*, or the *imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, which is acknowledged by all the *Orthodox*, to be *articulus ſtantis & cadentis Eccleſiæ*, the grand pillar of the Chriſtian Doctrine, without the ſupport of which all muſt go to ruine; Hence, (to name no others) *Pelagians* the bulk of *Papiſts*, *Socinians*, and the old *Libertine Anabaptiſts*, and their ſucceſſors now called *Quakers*, harmoniouſly agree in deriding, and abominating this Cardinal and Fundamental Doctrine of the *imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*.

7ly. Theſe Anabaptiſts *aſſerted the poſſibility of fulfilling the Law.* Bulling. lib. 1. cap. 8. and *that they were arrived at a perfection of degrees and without ſin*, Bulling. lib. 1. cap. 11. From this the Doctrine of the *Quakers* differeth nothing; yea the latter hath far outdone the former; for beſides that they commonly aſſert, that men may altogether fulfil the *Law* in this life, and be without ſin; For the denyal of which *Robert Barclay* promiſed continually to rail upon all the reformed; they to the horror of all men aſſert that man is equal with God; which I evince from the Words of *Hubberthorn* in chap. 4. of this Treatiſe, and that *the Soul is a part of God*, which is made good from the words of the famous, *and leading Quakers*, Ibid.

8ly. *Theſe* Anabaptiſts with blaſphemous *Melchoir* Hofman, denied the *perſeverance of the Saints*, Bulling. lib. 3. cap. 13. with whom theſe *Quakers* alſo conſpire, which any man in reaſon may judge a contradiction to their Doctrine of perfection; however they commonly maintain it with *Robert* Barclay, *Prop.*9. with his Apology and Vindication thereof; contradicting his own expreſs words cap. 2. where explaining that text 1 *John* 2.27. He had aſſerted that the *unction* there ſpoken of doth remain for ever in theſe to whom it is given.

9ly. Theſe wicked *Anabaptiſts* with their abominable Leader *David George*, denied the *Reſurrection of the Fleſh, or of the ſame body*, talking much of the Reſurrection of another more ſpiritual body *Bulling.* lib. 2. cap 10. In this alſo the *Quakers* are not a whit ſhort of theſe, as is made manifeſt chap. 5. of this Treatiſe.

10ly Theſe abominable *Anabaptiſts*, following their pernicious Leader, *Michael Servetus*, denyed the Sacred Trinity, and the Divinity of Chriſt; In this blaſphemy alſo the Scholars excell the Maſters, as the Reader may find at large made out chap. 4. of this Treatiſe.

11ly. Theſe Anabaptiſts aſſerted, that the *Miniſters of the Goſpel ought not to be tyed to the explaining of Scriptures*; *that all in the Church ought to ſpeak by turns, that which they judged the Spirit offered unto them*: that *the Miniſters ought to have no certain* Stipend, and many other things of this ſort, *Bulling.* lib. 1. cap. 8. which is at this day the known Doctrine of *Quakers*.

12ly. Theſe Anabaptiſts denied *that a Chriſtian ought to be a Magiſtrat, or in any caſe make war; to take or adminiſtrate oaths*, to trouble any man upon the account of his Religion, or to prohibite any kind of Religion; In all which points, the Quakers exactly jump with them; for tho they do not in words deny the lawfulneſs of Magiſtracy, yet ſeeing they expreſly deny the lawfulneſs of all Wars, and Oaths, and maintain an unbridled Liberty, to do whatſoever is right in a mans own eyes, all which is their known Doctrine, by moſt clear conſequence, they take away all uſe of Magiſtracy and Magiſtrates.

13ly. *Anabaptiſts* with *Servetus* and the *Socinians* ſpake contemptibly of the *Sacraments*, and denied *Infant*-Baptiſm; but the *Quakers* have gone a further length, not only denying, but railing againſt both *Sacraments*, labouring by might and main, to aboliſh theſe pledges of the Love of God out of the World, I could eaſily prove the ſameneſs of the Doctrine of the *Muncerian Anabaptiſts*, with that of the *Quakers* in many other particulars: But at preſent theſe may ſerve to ſhew, that both of them are acted and guided by the ſame Spirit; which is that at preſent intended by us.

3ly. If the Spirit, or the light within every man; were the *S*upreme, and principal Rule, then thoſe who perſecuted to death the *A*poſtles, and *S*aints of *G*od did not ſin in ſo doing; but I am ſure the latter is falſe, *Ergo* the former. The

Conſequence of the Major is moſt evident, for they followed their light within, thinking thereby they did God good ſervice, *John.* 16. 2. neither can they ſay, that then the day of all theſe perſecutors viſitation was paſt; for *Paul* himſelf was one of them, whoſe light taught him, that he according to all that he had for light ought to do many things againſt the Profeſſors, and Servants of Jeſus Chriſt, *Acts.* 26. 9. whoſe day of viſitation *I* think the *Quakers* themſelves will not ſay was expired.

4ly. Divine light, or that light which is of God is alwayes conſonant to it ſelf; but ſo is not that which the *Quakers* call their ſpirit, or the light within every man; for nothing is more evident than that the light within one man, is quite contradictory and oppoſite, to that within another, and that even in the moſt weighty, neceſſary and ſoul-concerning things in all the world; as the many and great controverſies in all ages, do but too too well make out: neither can it be ſaid that every one of theſe who oppoſe the truth, either act againſt their own judgment, or that ſometime before they knew and embraced the Truth in their heart, and afterward did not hearken to that light: this we ſay cannot be ſaid; for it is clear from the earneſtneſs, and zeal of both *Hereticks*, and *Heathens* for their own erroneous Principles, that they really think as they ſpeak: yea have not many ſacrificed their lives, to their own fantaſtick and dammable Opinions, which Opinions from the very beginning of their uſe of

Reaſon, they did ſtill hold; but not, to multiply inſtances, all this is clear in the Perſon of *Paul*, for certain it is, that when he perſecuted the Church, he both acted according to his judgment, and that he always was of that judgment, and never counteracted his light within, and tho he confeſſed that he did it out of ignorance, yet this will not help them, for certainly this was all the light he had, if we may believe himſelf, and therefore he never had a true light within, until the day of his miraculous converſion.

5ly. This Principle viz. *That if every man follow his light within, he cannot ſtray from the Truth*, overthroweth the whole fabrick of *Quakeriſm* with one blow; for there are many in the world (of which I am one) who by all the Light they have attained unto, and after the moſt impartial ſearch, firmly believe, without ſo much as one check from the light within to the contrary, that *Quakeriſm* is the path way to utter deſtruction; It muſt therefore be ſo, if the Doctrine, *that every one muſt follow his light*, be true.

6ly. *If* God ſuffered the moſt part of men in the time of the Old Teſtament to walk in their own ways, then all and every one hath not ſufficient Grace and Light whereby they may come to *Salvation*; But the former is true *Acts*, 14. 16. *Ergo* the latter. The evidence of the conſequence ſtrangely ſtraitneth *Bellarm*: *de grat.* & *lib. arbitr*: for he would fain wreſt this *Text*, telling us, that its meaning is, *The Grace of God did not ſo largely flow then as afterwards*, *notwithſtanding ſuch a mea-*

meaſure of Grace ſufficient to divine Providence was not wanting; but thus he diſſembleth the queſtion, which was whether or not it pleaſed divine providence to give a ſufficient meaſure of Grace, to every Individual of the Poſterity of *Adam*? 2ly. There are many Nations in the world, of which I believe, the *Jeſuits*, and *Quakers* will not ſay, that they have now more than ſufficient Grace to bring them to Salvation, *Ergo* if all Nations had leſſe under the Old Teſtament, than theſe nations have now, they had not ſufficient Grace. 3ly. The context evinceth our purpoſe, for the witneſs of God there ſpoken of, is only the common benignity of Providence, *viz.* fruitful ſeaſons, food and gladneſs, from which indeed they might have gathered, that there was a God, but was this grace alone ſufficient to bring them to Salvation? this, *Quakers* and *Jeſuits* muſt either ſay, or elſe that the *Apoſtle* had not wit enough to ſpeak to the purpoſe, for he might have mentioned this ſufficient Grace, and Light, as a Teſtimony of God in their hearts, and told them that this Light within would have led them to Heaven, if they had pleaſed, whereas contrariwiſe, he telleth them no ſuch guide, but that they were permitted to walk in their own wayes, and the ſame Apoſtle telleth the Gentiles, *Epheſ.* 2. 12. That they were without Chriſt: And yet in contradiction to this, the *Quakers* maintain, that theſe Gentiles had the *Light of Chriſt*, and *Chriſt* within them. This Anſwer of *Bellarmin* I have ſet down and refuted, becauſe it is all one in ſubſtance with that which the *Quakers* uſe to give to this and the like Texts.

7ly. Our next Argument we deduce from Epheſ. 2. 12, and 4. 8. Thus, *Theſe who are without Chriſt, aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, ſtrangers to the Covenants of Promiſe, have no hope, are without God in the World, have their underſtandings darkened through the blindneſs that is in them, being alienated from the life of God, and have blind Hearts, and are paſt feeling*; add to theſe, 2 Tim. 2. 26. That ſome are taken captive by the Devil at his will. Now theſe that are in this caſe, cannot have Grace and light ſufficient to Salvation: But the Gentiles are ſaid here to be in this ſad condition; *Ergo* they had not ſufficient Grace and Light. The *Major*, which can be only queſtioned, the Spirit of God hath in theſe places invincibly corroborat, by rejecting all the Shifts, and quibles that *Jeſuits* and *Quakers* are able to feign.

8ly. This Doctrine of the Quakers is clearly overthrown by theſe Scriptures. *Amos.* 3: 2, *You only have I known of all the Families of the Earth*, &c. Pſal. 147. 19, 20. *He ſheweth his Word unto Jacob, his Statutes and Judgments to Iſrael, he hath not dealt ſo with any Nation*; *as for his Judgments they have not known them*; *Praiſe ye the Lord.* What can be more clear, than that theſe to whom God did not give his Word, Statutes and Judgments, never had a light ſufficient to guide them unto Salvation? & yet the *Quakers*, *Quakeriſm confirm*: pag. 2. who without all ſhame or conſcience, care not what they deny, or what they affirm, providing they can find words to the purpoſe, or not to the purpoſe, all is one, have the confidence to deny it: Their reaſonleſſe Reaſon is becauſe in John 1. 5. its ſaid, that *the light ſhined in darkneſs*: For who but a *Quaker* will inferr from theſe words, in which the *Evangeliſt* aſſerteth, that Chriſt is the true God, who in all ages manifeſted himſelf in ſome meaſure to the world, by which manifeſtation of God in the Works of Creation and Providence, the world might perceive indeed that there was a God, but could not notwithſtanding comprehend God, ſo as to ſee and perceive that God the Creator, ſhould in the fulneſs of time, cloath himſelf with mans Fleſh, and become the *Redeemer*, for to this kind of Knowledge and Comprehenſion, ſupernatural and divine Light was neceſſary; now (I ſay) who but a *Quaker* will from this infer that all nations, in all ages, had the Knowledge of the Word, Statutes and Judgments of God? For, ſure I am, theſe who are altogether ignorant of them, in the Judgment of all men, (who have not with the Quakers renounced the Scriptures) will be eſteemed void of a light ſufficient to guide them to Salvation, with the like impudence page 5. they deprave yea and really contradict *Jude* v. 19. where the Apoſtle poſitively aſſerteth, that *ſome men have not the Spirit*; for they tell us *that men in one ſenſe may be ſaid not to have the Spirit, and in another ſenſe to have it, even as a rich man who improveth not his money,* *both hath it and hath it not in diverſe ſenſes, according to which Chriſt ſaid, from him that hath not, ſhall be taken away, that which he hath :* But this perverſion is too palpable, for ſurely the Apoſtle, whoſe *Pen* God guided, intimateth no ſuch thing, nor inſinuateth the leaſt reſpect wherein theſe men can be ſaid, to have the Spirit ; whereas our Saviour, whoſe words they groundleſly adduce to colour their contradiction of the Apoſtle, plainly telleth us that theſe evil ſervants, really had gifts which they abuſed, by neglecting to improve them ; But on the other hand, the Apoſtle here hath no ſuch thing, yea he telleth us that theſe men *were twice dead*, i. e. *I* think, as dead as can be, or altogether void of the *Spirit* ; yea it can be no more alledged, that theſe men in any ſenſe had the Spirit , than that clouds only ſwelling with wind, can be ſaid to be filled with water; yea without all exception, or reſtriction, they are called, ſenſual, & I think few that care what they ſay, will affirm that ſuch have the Spirit of God; where doth the Apoſtle in all this Epiſtle, ever compare theſe men, to theſe that have money, but do not occupy it ? as the *Quakers* groundleſly, and therefore falſly give out ; and yet theſe are the men who cry out upon us, for making any Paraphraſes upon, or Conſequences from Scripture, though never ſo clearly deduced from the Text, while they themſelves by more than a poetick licenſe, obtrude upon the world flat contradictions of Scripture, for the meaning thereof. Add to theſe, that ſome things are abſolutly neceſſary to be known in order to Salvation; the Knowledge of which can never be evinced that all men had, or have, therefore it is moſt groundleſſe to aſſert, that all men have a ſufficient light to guide them to eternal life, to which Robert Barclay replyeth, that *the knowledge of theſe things is only neceſſary* neceſſitate præcepti, *that is, becauſe they are commanded us; not* neceſſitate medii, i. e. *in plain Engliſh, That Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, the knowledge of the Diſtinction of Father*, Son, *and Holy Ghoſt, or that Chriſt is God and Man* &c. *is not needful in themſelves to be known, or believed in order to* Salvation; but how little ſoever reſpect he hath to the Scriptures, he ought to have had ſome care and conſideration of his own *Doctrine*, for his firſt Theſis is, theſe words John 17. 3. *this is eternal life* &c. where it is plainly aſſerted without any diſtinction, or limitation, that the Knowledge of the Father and the Son, as one ſending, and one that is ſent, and therefore diſtinct the one from the other, is called *eternal life* it ſelf, i. e, (if any thing) a mean ſo neceſſary to eternal life, as that without this knowledge it cannot be obtained. Moreover, the very Notion of Faith (without which none can be ſaved) implyeth nothing leſſe than a cloſing with God through Chriſt, and therefore neceſſarily, and of its own nature, and not with a reſpect to a command only, preſuppoſeth the knowledge of the diſtinction of Father and Son, and of the Divine and Humane Nature of Chriſt, held forth under the Old Teſtament: as one to be incarnate in the fulneſs of time;

and in the New Teſtament as actually incarnate, and really and in due Time come in the Fleſh.

9ly. Before I come to the *Quakers* Objections, I will overthrow one other of the *Quakers* Principles, upon which the whole Fabrick of *Quakeriſm* is builded; which is, That *in fallen man, there remain no reliques of the Image of God, and that by the fall, his underſtanding is ſo darkned, that he cannot by all the Light of Conſcience, reaſon, and common notions, perceive or gather, from all or any of the works of creation and providence, that there is a Supream being, or a God that created him, and all things beſide.* In a word they utterly deny, that which is called *the natural knowledge of God, or natural Theology*; and deny moreover, that *man in his fallen ſtate, can think, or do any thing that is in it ſelf, or as to the ſubſtance of the action Good*; This Doctrine (which the *Quakers* have learned from their dear Friends the *Socinians*, as they are conſtrained to defend, ſo ſeeing they aſſert that every Son, and Daughter of Adam have within them a light and guide ſufficient for Salvation; and the World clearly perceiveth that there is no Light common to all Mankind, except ſome ſmal Relicts of that once bright-ſhining Image of God, like the dim ſparkles of an extinguiſhed *Lanthorn*, which are never able to ſhew the wandring Traveler in the dark night, his way homeward; They are neceſſitate to ſay, that this Light is ſupernatural, and a fruit of the purchaſe of Chriſt, and conſequently that man, as to the things of God, hath no more Natural Light, than an Ox or Aſſe: See *Rob*: *Barclay's* *clay's fourth Theſe* and his *Apology* cap 4. and *Vindication* ſect 5.

10ly. The falſhood of this Doctrine, we evince by theſe following arguments; and 1. It is not imaginable how one can be rational, and yet not be in caſe to infer from all the works of Creation, that there is a ſupream cauſe and beeing; we ſay this is not imaginable except to a *Socinian* and *Quaker*, who can imagin, at leaſt ſay, they can imagin what they will. Now the *Quakers*, *Quakeriſm confirm*: pag 3. Grant that *Conſcience and* Reaſon, *are diſtinguiſhed from the ſaving* Light *of Chriſt, in all men, and the* Revelation *thereof as a natural and ſuper-principle natural, are diſtinguiſhed*. Well then, ſeing reaſon is natural, and man is rational, how can he, if he but contemplat theſe admirable Works of Creation and Providence, and exerciſe his reaſon in ſo doing, not conclude that theſe are the Product of an Infinit and Omnipotent Creator, who is to be Loved, Feared, and Adored? which thoughts of themſelves or as to the ſubſtance of the Action are certainly good, and more Laudable than the *Quakers ſilent waiting*, which differeth nothing from ſleeping, although they place a principal part of their worſhip therein.

11ly. Secondly, whatever is in man, and common to all Mankind, is natural, but ſome ſparks of the knowledge of a Deity, as alſo ſome thoughts and deſires that are good in themſelves, as for example, the deſire of ſelf-preſervation, are in man, and common to all mankind; *Ergo* ſome Relicts of the knowledge of God, and thoughts that are of themſelves really good, are natural. The Major is moſt evident, for I defy all the *Socinians* and *Quakers* in the world, to give one Inſtance to the contrary: the Minor is no leſſe undenyable, ſeing there is no nation in the world, tho never ſo barbarous and inhumane, who hath not ſome notions of a Deity, and deſire to preſerve themſelves. But I know the *Quakers* dare not deny it, otherwayes they will overthrow all their *univerſal Grace*, and *Light* by them pleaded for.

12ly. Thirdly, that which is originally born with every one, and groweth up to more and more maturity, as he in whom it is, groweth up, is undoubtedly natural; But ſome remainders of the knowledge of God are Originally, i e. in the principle and inclination (as they ſpeak) born with man, and grow up to more and more maturity, according to the growth of him, in whom they are, *Ergo* they are natural. The Major is beyond controverſie: The Minor therefore they can only deny, which yet is no leſſe clear than the major; for they grant that ſome things that reſpect natural Sciences, and the prudent management of the affairs of the world, are not ſupernatural; See the fore-cited Vindication page 52. But certain it is, that ſome ſparkles of the knowledge of a Deity, are as common and appear as early as theſe things which they deny not to be natural.

13ly. Fourthly, That which is common to Devils, is not ſupernatural; but to know and believe, that there is a God, which is of it ſelf a good thought, is common to devils. To this *Robert*

Barclay Vind *pag* 51. anſwers, That *once the Devils had this knowledge from a ſpiritual nature, and tho they have fallen, yet they mey retain the memory of it: for that their Fall and mans is every way alike, none will affirm.* But ſurely if he had not willfully cloſed his Eyes, that he might not ſee the Truth, he might have clearly perceived this to be a moſt pitiful prevarication, for what tho the fall of Angels, and the fall of Man, were not in all reſpects alike, can any man not altogether void of reaſon, conclude thence; that the thing which is common to devils with men, can be ſupernatural, or Grace in the one more than in the other? Again, Surely there is no reaſon in the world to ſay, that the devils retain their Memory, more than their underſtanding; For certainly the underſtanding is altogether as eſſential, if not more, to the rational creature, as the memory. Moreover, to ſay that the devils retained no knowledge of God, but the bare remembrance that they had knowledge of God, is compleatly to contradict the Apoſtle *James*, aſſerting chap 1. 19. that *the devils believe that there is one God and tremble*; for to believe a thing, in the judgement of all men, preſuppoſeth ſome knowledge thereof, and can be no more called an Act of the memory, than taſting can be called ſeeing, which is performed by the Eye; or Smelling, that which is performed by the Ear. Again, preſuppoſing, which is poſſible, though not true, that the Devils had no memory of their knowledge of God, It is beyond all doubt, that theſe active, Sagacious, and ſkilful Spirits in the works of Nature, can eaſily conclud from theſe admirable Effects, that there is *a Supream Cauſe, firſt beeing,* the Creator of all things: Now to ſay, that they can know that there is one God, and conclud from the works of Creation and Providence, that this God is moſt powerful, moſt wiſe &c. and yet to ſay that they have no principle of knowledge, whereby they can know this, is to aſſert that there is a Stream without a Source, or a Tree without a Root, or a Beam without the Sun. Laſtly, If the Devils have only the memory of their knowledge of God, and yet believe that there is a God and tremble, then we may infer, that our firſt Parents, before the promiſe of the Meſſiah was made unto them, had no Divine Light, or Seed left in them, contrary to *Robert Barclay*'s beleif *Vind pag* 49. Seing our firſt Parents might retain the memory of the knowledge of God, they had but juſt now loſt; But it is needleſs to dwell upon ſuch nonſenſical abſurdities, for the *Quaker* may as well affirm, that a man may pay his debt, and ſuſtain himſelf with the memory of the money he once had, as that the Devils can know ſo much of God, as without doubt they know, by the alone memory of the knowledge they once had.

14ly. Fifthly. That which will accompany the wicked to Hell, cannot be called Grace, Divine or any thing Supernatural; but ſome relicts of the knowledge of God will accompany the wicked to Hell: Therefore theſe cannot be called Grace, Divine, or any thing Supernatural; The Major is beyond all controverſie; The Minor is alſo moſt evident, for otherwayes the never-dying worm could not feed upon them, whoſe torment conſiſts moſt in the extremly bitter,and ſad reflection upon, and conſideration of, the various Attributes of God, with reference to themſelves ; Exem: gra. from the conſideration of his immutable Juſtice and infinite Power , they conclude the impoſſibility of their releif. But we need not inſiſt on this, ſeing none that read *Luk 16.* can be ignorant that theſe Souls have ſome knowledge of God, except either willfull prejudice, or ſome thing of that kind, hath already preoccupied their minds.

15ly. *S*ixthly, That men have naturally ſome relicts of the *I*mage of God, and can do ſome things contained in the *L*aw of God, we moſt firmly conclude from that expreſs Text . *Rom* 2. 14. *the Gentiles that have not the* Law, *do by nature the things contained in the* Law. The *Quakers*, and amongſt others, Rob : *Barclay in his Apology* flately contradicting the Text, Alledgeth, that man *naturally can know, or do nothing contained in the* Law *of God, becauſe v* 15. *theſe Gentiles of whom this is ſpoken, are ſaid to have the* Law *written in their hearts, which writing of the* Law *in mens hearts , is elſewhere in Scripture counted a part of the new Covenant.* But this reaſon Mr. *Brown* chap 5. n. 24. hath fully enervat , ſhewing by many demonſtrations, that the writing of the Law in the heart, cannot at all be taken in this place, for any part of the New Covenant, the removal of which arguments, the *Quaker* not ſo much as attempteth, & yet can impudently publiſh a lie to the world; that he hath vindicat

dicat his *Apologie*; Yea, in ſtead of anſwering the Arguments, he confirmeth what his Adverſary ſayeth, and contradicteth himſelf: For *Vind pag* 51. He granteth *that men by Nature, or Natural* Light, *have knowledge of* Politicks *and the prudent management of worldly affairs, and other things of that kind.* Hence I conclude that even according to the *Quaker* himſelf a man may be ſaid to have the Law of God written in his heart, and yet have no new Covenant Diſpenſation, Seeing the ſecond table of the Law, which is a Rule, for Politicks, and prudent Adminiſtration of worldly affairs, is the Law of God as well as the firſt. The *Quaker* added a ſecond reaſon in his *Apologie* to prove that by NATVRE in this place, is not to be underſtood, the corrupt nature of man, viz, *becauſe then the Apoſtle ſhould contradict himſelf, who ſaith* 1 Cor. 2. 14. *that the natural man cannot know the things of God, amongſt which things of God, the Law muſt be accounted, which* Rom. 7. 12. *Is called Holy, Juſt and good*; which contradiction, *Mr. Broun* utterly denyed to follow upon our expoſition of this place, ſhewing at large, *Num.* 25. the compleat harmony of theſe places, notwithſtanding of our expoſition, to which the *Quaker* thinks it enough to reply, *that the meaning given by* Mr: Broun *to the Text in hand, cannot be reconciled with what the Apoſtle ſayeth* 1 Cor 2. 14. *unleſs upon ſome ſuppoſition* (but what that is he telleth us not) *above by him denyed.* Now, Reader, had this man a reſpect either to Cauſe or Credit, who thought to cheat the world with ſuch pitiful nothings as theſe? For this was one of his Apologetick arguments, whereby to overthrow the common Expoſition of this Text, & to eſtabliſh the gloſs put upon it by the *Socinians*, whom he never leaveth to follow ; and inſtead of urging this Argument, taketh the part of the defendant, and ſo giveth up the cauſe : for his anſwer ridiculouſly ſuppoſeth , that we urge this place 1 *Cor*. 2. 14. as an Argument againſt us , which they urge as an Argument againſt us : And although his *Adverſaries* Expoſition cannot ſtand, but upon a ſuppoſition denyed by the *Quaker*, it is little matter, for we know the whole Goſpel cannot ſtand, but upon many ſuppoſitions denyed and cryed out againſt by that blaſphemous party. And here pag 51. he Alledgeth, *that he acknowledgeth the fall of man, more fully than his adverſary doth, becauſe according to his adverſary, fallen man retained ſome* Relicts *of the Image of God, by vertue whereof he can do ſomething really good ; whereas on the other hand, according to the* Quakers *Doctrine, man by the fall was wholly degenerate, retaining nothing of the Image of God, in whom albeit there remained a Seed of righteouſneſs, yet no otherwayes, than as a naked ſeed in barren ground, by vertue of which he could do nothing, until viſited by a new Viſitation, which he received by vertue of Chriſt as Mediator.*

Anſ. In the judgement of all men who are not ſo effronted, as to give ſuch inconſiſtances for a ſufficient Refutation of their Adverſaries ; It will be counted a compleat contradiction, to ſay, that fallen man hath no *Reliques* of the Image of God , and yet notwithſtanding, hath a Seed of Righteouſneſs in him, *S*eing that Righteouſneſs is one of the chief parts of the Image of God. *Eph.* 4. 24. But the truth is, there is a *Myſtery* latent under this doctrine, which we muſt here diſcover: The Myſtery is this, the *Quakers* have no other Chriſt than this that was left in *Adam*, and remaineth in man in his fallen condition, to which they give many great names, as *Light*, *Life*, *Meaſure of God*, *God himſelf*, and among others moſt frequently, *the Seed*; for the more full manifeſtation of which, take theſe following paſſages 1. *Naylor's love to the loſt*, pag. 32. *Chriſt is the Election, and the Elect Seed, and* George Fox's *Great myſt*; pag. 24. *the promiſe of God, is to the ſeed that hath been loaded as a* Cart *with ſheaves by the Sinner, which ſeed is the hope of Chriſtians, or that which was loaded as a Cart under ſheaves.* George Keith in *his way caſt up*, pag 99, 100, 108. Exponeth it to be *Chriſt or the life of Chriſt*; and in his *Immed. Revel*: pag 44, 45, 46. Sayeth, *when God created Man, he put his Image Chriſt, the expreſs Image of himſelf in man, he breathed into him the breath of* Life, *he lived in* God; *and Chriſt the light of men, was his life and lived in him, then the* Lamb *was not ſlain, Chriſt the* Lamb, *the life of man.*——— But *when man ſinned* ——— *So the* Lamb *came to be ſlain in him from the Foundation of the world; that holy meek* ——— *nature, the Lambs nature was ſlain in him* ——— ——*the bowels of the fathers* Love *ſtirred in compaſſion to the Work of his own hands, that of the Pure creation in man, which though ſhut up in death, yet it remained and periſhed not, as to its being, it did* *not become a nothing, but remained a beeing, and this is the loſt, which God ſent his ſon into the world to ſeek and to ſave, not to ſeek and ſave the old Adam that birth of the Serpents begetting, but to deſtroy it, for it is not capable of Gods Salvation, but that which Chriſt came to ſave, is that of God which proceeded from him, the ſeed of God in man, the ſeed of Abraham, whereof Abrams old decayed body as good as dead, and* Sarahs *barren womb was a Type.* Moreover, by this *Light of God*, for all is one, they underſtand Chriſt, or God himſelf, as ſhall afterward be more fully made out, by ſeveral expreſs Aſſertions of the *Quakers*. Hence we may ſee that the Doctrine of this man is moſt damnable, who acknowledgeth no other Chriſt, but the ſmal and dark Reliques of the Image of God in mans ſoul, and that his Hypocriſie and diſſimulation is unparalellably great and hateful; in that even while he pretends to aggredge the fall of man moſt, he then exalteth man even in his lapſed Condition; beyond which it is hardly poſſible to elevat the nature of man, for from what is here quoted, and ſhal be more largely afterward alledged out of their writings, it is evident that they beleive, or at leaſt would perſwade others to beleive, that Chriſt has a Perſonal union with every Son and Daughter of *Adam*. To all this he addeth a moſt blaſphemous and abſurd Intimation, that *this Seed*, (which to him is alone with Chriſt or God,) *ſtands in need of a new Viſitation of Chriſt, to raiſe it up and make it active.* Alſo here becauſe his Adverſary ſaith from Rom. 7. 14. and 1 *Cor.* 3. 1. *that the Apoſtle and all*

all Beleivers, are in a certain reſpect carnal, he thinks he hath gotten him in a notable abſurdity, Saying, *his Divinity will run thus ; the Devil and all unregenerate men, are in a certain reſpect ſpi. tual, and the Apoſtle and all regenerate men, are in a certain reſpect Carnal;* But if there be any abſurdity, in ſaying that the Apoſtle and all Beleivers, are in a certain reſpect Carnal, it will light upon the Scriptures, according to which his Adverſary ſpake, and thus the *Quakers* covertly purſue their Deſign of wounding the Scriptures, through the ſides of their Adverſaries, and altho he ſhall anſwer that the Apoſtle *Rom* 7. did ſpeak of another in the perſon of himſelf , I care not ſeing to all the fifteen Arguments whereby *Mr:* Broun proved the Apoſtle to be there ſpeaking of himſelf, and not of another , the *Quaker* thinketh it enough to ſay, *He giveth us a Preachment upon this place* without a ſyllable more for Solution of theſe arguments. As for theſe words, *that the Devils are in a certain reſpect Spiritual,* they are none of his Adverſaries; However the devil may be called Spiritual, in reſpect of his nature, ſeing whatever is a Spirit, may be called Spiritual ; as well as what is a Body, may be called Corporeal. Hence it is Evident, that the *Quaker's* pretended Abſurdities, and Blaſphemies, which he would fix upon his Adverſary, reſolve into meer fictitious Hobgoblines, fit only to fright Children.

16ly. Seventhly, If Fallen Man retain no knowledge of God, no Principles of common Honeſty and Morality, then there is no difference between a Man and a Brute, neither can it be told in what the wiſdom of the Wiſe Gentiles, of whom the Apoſtle ſpeaketh 1 *Cor.* 2. who notwithſtanding could not perceive the things of God until they were again revealed, conſiſted: but the latter is falſe in both its parts, therefore the firſt; *Robert Barclay* Vindic. pag. 52. anſwereth that *the Wiſdom of theſe Gentiles did conſiſt in the wiſe and prudent Management of worldly Affairs, for it is not yet proved, ſayeth he, that it is neceſſarily united to a Knowledge of God, and things* Spiritual, *ſince it is ſaid of ſome Beaſts, that they have ſomething of this, ſuch as Bees and Ants. And that notwithſtanding Man differeth from a Brute in many things, as in the knowledge of numbers, Mathematical and Mechanical Demonſtrations, Is the Knowledge of ſuch natural Truths, (that two and three make five, and the whole is greater than the part, and all that is deduced therefrom) the Knowledge of the things of God?* but theſe Evaſions are as eaſily everted as invented, for who can deny that by the ſame ſpecies or kind of Knowledge, and reaſon whereby man can deduce excellent politick, and Oeconomick Concluſions and order a Common-wealth, or Family, he can alſo conclude from the beautiful Fabrick and comely order of Heaven and Earth, and the admirable Providence of God apparent therein, that there is a firſt and ſupreme Power, from which theſe things did proceed, and by which they are guided into their proper ends: And indeed in this did conſiſt the wiſdom of the wiſe Heathens, as is evident to any that have but the leaſt acquaintance with the writings of *Plato*, *Ariſtotle* and ſuch other heathniſh *Philoſophers*, to whom the inviſible things of God, even his eternal Power and God-head, were made manifeſt by the things that are made, being by them ponderated and contemplated *Rom.* 1. 20. Certain it is, that it is as eaſy by the ſame kind of Knowledge and Reaſon, to know that every effect hath a cauſe as to know that the whole is greater than a part; But the *Quaker* granteth, that by natural light only a man may know this latter *Axiom* with whatſoever can be deduced from it, Ergo he may as eaſily know the former, with whatſoever may be deduced from it; but from this former *Axiom* the natural *Philoſophers* firmly conclude, that there is a *Supreme Cauſe*, Ergo a man having natural Light only may conclude from this *Axiom*, which is imprinted on the hearts of all men, that there is a *ſupreme Cauſe*, or *Author* of all things, which is *God*. Moreover it is certain, that the defect of the Wiſdom of the *Heathens*, is every where by Scripture placed in this, that by it they could not perceive Chriſt, and the Myſteries of the Goſpel; which as they were to the *Jews a ſtumbling Block*; ſo they were to the wiſe *Greeks fooliſhneſs*; and no where in this, that they could not ſo much as know that there is an Omnipotent and Juſt God, which ought to be reverenced and ſerved, though with what kind of Worſhip they knew not; and that we ought to do unto another, as we would he ſhould do to us. Again, that a Brute hath more knowledge in *Politicques* or *Oeconomicks* than it hath in *Mechanicks*, or *Arithmetick* is falſe and ridiculous for indeed they have alike in both, for if the Bee can imitate the *Politician*, or the Governour of a Family, ſhe can alſo be the ape of the Mechanick, and prettily imitate him in making Cells to contain honey; the hen alſo, when ſhe hatcheth, or hath brought forth, can perceive if any be wanting of her Eggs or Birds. Hence I may conclude that the Hen is as skilful in Arithmetick as the Bee is in policie; the hungry dog alſo will be very loath to part with any piece of the Morſel he hath gotten into his clutches. Hence I may as well conclude that a dog underſtandeth that *Axiom* viz. that *the whole is greater than the part*; as the Bee or Ant underſtand the Fundamentals of policie and Oeconomie. But it is needleſſe to dwell any longer in the refutation of theſe things which are no leſſe unreaſonable than impious.

17'y. Our eight Argument we draw from *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. *Becauſe that which may be known of God is*, &c. from which place our Divines have alwayes concluded againſt the *Socinians*, ſee *Pareus* on chap. 1. to the Romans dub. 16. and why may not we with as good Reaſon againſt the *Quakers*, infer, That there are ſome reliques of the Divine Image or Natural Knowledge of God left in man; againſt which inference *Robert Barclay* pag. 52. ſaith *that by* το γνωστον τȣ Θεȣ *that which is to be known of God, is not underſtood any thing which man retained in the fall, but a new viſitation of Light and Grace: And 2dly that tho this Knowledge of God be common to all men, yet they receive it only by this new*

new viſitation of Grace and Light: But to anſwer at this rate, is only loudly & confidently to proclaim that his Doctrine is pure *Paganiſm*, for who that ever thought there was any Neceſſity of the Chriſtian Religion in order to Salvation, would dare to affirm, that what was common to the Heathens, yea & devils alſo, was as really ſaving, & the fruit of Chriſts purchaſe as that which is proper to the godly: For ſurely this kind of Knowledge of *God*, of which the Apoſtle here ſpeaketh, and ſayeth that it is learned by the contemplation of the Creatures is common, not only to all the *Heathens*, but even to the Devils themſelves. I hope we have by this time ſufficiently demonſtrated, that there are ſome reliques of the knowledge of *God*, and ſomething of the principles of Morality remaining in man, even conſidered in his lapſed Condition, We have alſo vindicated ſo many of *Mr. Browns* Arguments as the *Quaker* thinks fit to take notice of, many others he hath left untouched, ſee for Examples ſake chap. 5. num. 28, 29, 30. But indeed the *Quaker* here as he doth all along playeth like the Dog in *Nile*, making a mint and then to his heels again; for he either leaves the Arguments and Proofs of his Adverſary, as alſo his anſwers given to *his* Arguments altogether untouched, or elſe oppoſeth ſuch pitiful Trifles, as being examined and preſſed, inſtantly reſolve in the apples of *Sodom*; and yet certainly here, if ever, the *Quaker* was concerned to have played the man, and given ſufficient ground for this Doctrine: For with this light all the *Quakers* Religion ſtandeth and falleth, which indeed is nothing but the meer Remainders, and ſmall ſpunks of that ſometimes bright Image, that ſhined in our firſt Parents, which altho they can never be quenched, yet are never alike, or ſufficient to reveal theſe Myſteries; The knowledge of which, is abſolutly neceſſar to Salvation, or to lead man through the dark and dangerous Wilderneſs of this World, into the more excellent Canaan of eternal reſt: And therefore there is no Light common to mankind ſufficient for Salvation, ſeing all men have no other Light common to them, but this, which we have evinced to be altogether natural; and yet this natural Light, is to the *Quakers*, their *God*, their *Chriſt*, their *Grace*, their *Scriptures*, and whatſoever elſe is neceſſary to Salvation. That it is to them their Rule, or in ſtead of the Scriptures, we have ſeen already; and that this Light alſo is to them in ſtead of God and Chriſt, or that in their account, this Light of reaſon and Conſcience, for no other is common to all men, is God himſelf, theſe following paſſages evince: *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men. If the Life be the Divine Eſſence, the Light muſt be ſo alſo; for ſuch as the Cauſe is, ſuch the Effect muſt be*; Thus *George Whitehead* in a Manuſcript cited by *Hicks Quaker. Appeal anſwered* pag 4. and *Will* Pen to defend this paſſage from the abſurdities with which it had been loaded by *Hicks*, in his firſt *Dialogue* pag 3, 4. ſuch as, that then the Sun, Moon, Star, or Stone, is God, ſpeaketh thus. "*George Whitehead inferring from John* 1. *That if the Life was of the* Di-

“ Divine Beeing, the Light muſt be the ſame, for as
“ the Cauſe is, ſo is the Effect ; it was never *George*
Whitehead's principle or words , that the Life,
“ which is the Light of men, is but in it ſelf a meer Effect ;
“ for he owns it in its own beeing to be no other,
“ than God himſelf counterf: Chriſt: detected
“ pag 56 and again *Wil. Pen. Reaſon againſt railing*.
“ pag. 56 We aſſert the true Light, with which
“ every man is enlightned, to be in it ſelf the Chriſt
“ of God, and the Saviour of the world. The
“ ſame *Will*: *Pen*, *Quakeriſm* a new Nickname
“ pag 9, 10. All men are enlightned ——— this
“ *Light* is Divine, becauſe it is the very Light of
“ the world, which is God, not any effect of his
“ power as a created *Light*, as ſome men fancy, and
George Whitehead Dipl, pl: pag 13. to call the Light
“ in every man a meer Creature, is contrary to *John*
“ 1. In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of
men, which Light, is Divine and Increated. Alſo
“ *George Fox* great Myſt: pag 10. Some call the
“ Light Conſcience. ——— which Light was before
“ Conſcience was or Creature was, or Created, or
“ made Light was; He made the Sun, the Moon —
“ and the Light was before theſe were made ; and
“ *pag* 23. ſome call it a natural Light, which Light
“ was before the word Conſcience was, or a natural
“ Light the *Sun*, Moon, or Stars either ; for all
“ things that were made, were made by it, the natural
“ Light, or made Light, are created Lights, It
“ made the *Sun*, Moon, and *Stars* , they were
“ made, & here it is the natural *Light* to the natura
“ Eye, and the light that every man is enlightne
“ with, that cometh into the world, was before theſ

wer

"were made, glorified with the Father before the
"world began, *Idem pag* 185. The *Light* which e-
"very man that cometh into the World, is en-
"lightned withal, *is* Chriſt, by whom the world
"was made. And pag 331. The Light which e-
"very one that cometh into the world is enlightned
"withal, is not Conſcience, for the Light was be-
"fore any thing was made, or Conſcience named.
George Fox younger, in a Collection of his Works pag 171. *Thus ſpeaketh*, All mind that Gift of God
"in your ſelves, which maketh you ſenſible of your
"preſent condition, you muſt receive the living
"principle of God, in your own particular veſſels,
"which principle I call the *Light*, it being a proper
Name for it; But I ſhal not deſire to tye up any of
"you, to give this principle of Truth only the name
"of Light, I ſhall not matter if you call it the Truth,
"or the gift of God, are a meaſure of the eternal
"Beeing. Now, Reader, did ever the *Sun* ſhine upon ſuch a Black and Blaſphemous Company of men: who durſt aſſert that that dim Light, by which moſt men have enough ado to perceive that there is a *Suprem Beeing*, and notwithſtanding of which knowledge, they are Ignorant of the true way of the Worſhip of God, the Myſtery of the Sacred Trinity, the Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus, his Natures, and Offices, and are at every turn ready to deceive, and be deceived, I ſay, did ever a company of Men outdo, yea, or ever equalize theſe *Quakers*, who dare aſſert ſuch a *Light* as this to be God? Notwithſtanding of this their matchleſs exaltation of this Light within every man, they a-

gain at other times, and when occaſion ſerveth, depreſs and bring low, the ſame as much as before they cryed it up; For they aſſert that the Light within any particular perſon, ought to yeild and ſtoop to the light of their Church, or conſtitut body, For *William Pen, Spirit of Alex:* pag 14. ſayeth, *We deny that to be a Light, which oppoſeth the judgement of the body.* Ibid pag 4. 5. *We as a body have power to determine, therefore we abhor, renounce, rebuke with all ſeverity that rude imagination of the Hat-on in publick prayer;* and Sp. of the hat pag 21, *We have the power, and will not ſuch as are in the power do right.* Ibid. *the body will have a true ſenſe, feeling, and underſtanding of Motions, Viſions, Revelations, and Doctrines, therefore it is ſafeſt to make her the touchſtone in all things relating to God.* Behold, Reader as, the *Quakers* with the *Papiſts* reject the Scriptures from being the Suprem Rule, and ultimat Judge; So they no leſs than the groſſeſt of the *Romaniſts* aſcribe an Infallibility to their Church, and make this the ſuprem Rule, and ultimat Judge, to which every mans Light within muſt ſtoop and yeild though never ſo clear: which is one of the groſſeſt Errors of *Popery*; *But* yet it is infinitly more groſs and impious in the *Quakers*, for in ſo doing, they proclaim the fallibility of that which they maintain to be Chriſt, and God, and ſubject it unto another, as capable of deceiving, and being deceived, which Impiety, I am ſure is ſcarc equalized,

18ly. Although the abſurdity of this Doctrine, m of it ſelf abundantly ſecure us, that we need not b

muc

much concerned, let them uſe what Arguments they will to prove it; we being certain, that whatever arguments can prove this, will equally ſerve to prove whatever entereth into any mans fancy; yet I will propoſe, and enervat theſe of their arguments which ſeem to be moſt ſtrong, and plead moſt for them. One of which is propoſed by *George Keith*, *Truth-defend*: pag 87. *A Divine Law in all men is an inward immediat Dictat, but there is a Divine Law in all men.* Of this Argument ſingled out of all that ever *George Keith* wrote, as the choiceſt Maſterpeice, to uphold *Quakeriſm*, and overthrow the authority of the Scriptures, he is ſo confident, that by it alone, he thinketh to ſtrike the Cauſe dead; But he is hugely miſtaken; for if by a divine Law, he underſtand any other thing beſide Conſcience, and Reaſon, which he himſelf, together with his Brother Rob: *Barclay*: *Quakeriſm confirm*: pag 3. acknowledgeth, to be only natural. We deny his Minor, the proof of which we expect *ad Kalendas Græcas*; And thus the great Argument of one of the greateſt Champions of the *Quakers*, evaniſheth into ſmoak at the very firſt handling thereof. 2ly. Rob: *Barclay. Vind* pag 39. thus reaſoneh, *what if I ſhould ſay, is not God a Light? And is not he in every man? and is not this Light within the increated Spirit?* The Reader may here obſerve, that this Author is diffident of this Argument, and fearful to bring it forth; and good reaſon he hath; for by this reaſon he only evinceth, that which he elſewhere by all means endeavoureth to evite, *viz*, that the *Quakers* Grace, and Light, is common to

Devils and damned Souls, for God can no more be ſaid to be in every Son and Daughter of *Adam* without exception, than in theſe wicked Spirits, if he think othewayes, let him eſſay the proof of it. 3ly. For the ſufficiency of their univerſal Light, they thus argue: *That which we ſin in not obeying, is ſufficient to Salvation; but in not obeying the* Light *within, we ſin, therefore it is ſufficient to* Salvation. But this Sophiſm is too palpable, and groſs to take with any that is not altogether willing to be deceived; for the Major propoſition thereof is moſt falſe, otherwiſe the lawful commands of every Parent, Heathen, as well as Chriſtian, ſhould be a ſufficient guide to Salvation, for diſobedience to theſe, is as really a ſin, as diſobedience to our own Light. 4ly. To prove that there is a Divine Light purchaſed by Chriſt, in every man, they adduce *John* 1.9. *That was the true Light, which enlightneth every man that cometh into the world*: for Vindication of which place it ſhall ſuffice to overthrow what *Rob: Barclay* hath ſaid in the *Vindication* of his *Apology* pag 91. For the confirmation of the *Quakers* gloſs on this text: of which Mr: Broun, *Quaker: path way to Pagan*: pag 151, 152, 153, 154. had given diverſe expoſitions, as 1. *that* Light *may be here taken for the* Light *of reaſon*. 2ly. That by every man, is *not to be underſtood every individual, but only every one which is ſavingly enlightned*; theſe expoſitions with others, he at large evinceth and illuſtrateth from Scripture and reaſon; and ſheweth that the *Quakers* joyn with the *Socinians* in their expoſition. Now whereas, if the *Quaker* had done any thing to the purpoſe, he ought to have refuted theſe expoſitions; but in ſtead thereof he ſayeth, *his adverſary muſt be much puzled with this Scripture, for he knoweth not what way to take it*: But this I confeſs is a ſtrange inference, for the *Quaker* from abundance, inferreth penury, and becauſe his adverſary gave diverſe expoſitions, any of which will ſerve the turn, *Ergo* (ſayes he) *he knows not what to anſwer*. I was wondering at this Conſequence, but I preſently remembred that the *Quakers* were Enemies to *Logick*. He himſelf diverſe times hath given ſeveral meanings of one place, as for Example, *Iſa.* 8. 20. much therefore he hath been puzled to anſwer our arguments, proving the Scriptures to be our principal Rule, which I do really believe, tho upon another account: Now it is obſervable that this *Quaker* almoſt every where endeavoureth to turn Defendent, when he ſhould be impugnant; for the Scriptures from which he drew his arguments in his *Apology*, failing him, ſo that he can prove nothing from them, his Adverſary having removed the verniſhing of his Sophiſtry, he bendeth his whole wit in his Vindication to find out Evaſions, and Diſtinctions, to defend his own gloſſe, and this artifice he uſeth here, which, think of it what he will, will ſerve for nothing, except to diſcover his Weakneſs and Conviction of a bad cauſe; and whereas he flouteth at his Adverſary inferring from v. 5. of this chapter, *the darkneſs comprehended it not*; that by *darkneſs* is meant *man in his natural Eſtate, in which Eſtate he can comprehend what is natural*; we ſay whereas he flouteth at him, inferring from this, that man while in that Eſtate, is void of all Spiritual and ſupernatural light, ſaying, *is not this a learned Refutation, Reader?* He ſheweth only good will (as they uſe to ſay) to have the Doctrine of the *Reformed* become a mocking ſtock, and ſhame rubbed upon it, if he could; for all the expoſitions given by the *Reformed Churches*, on this place, quite contradict that of the Quakers, except he will call *Socinus*, and the like, *Reformed* Proteſtants; But the thing incumbent to the *Quaker* was, the urging and vindicating of his Reaſon, viz. *that if man in his natural eſtate cannot comprehend this Light, who notwithſtanding can comprehend the things of Nature, Ergo by this enlightning with which every man is ſaid to be enlightned that cometh into the world, is not underſtood the Light of Nature and Reaſon*; which conſequence he ſhal never be able to prove, for altho the Light it ſelf *viz. Chriſt*, be ſupernatural, and the incomprehenſible God of Nature, yet theſe little Beams or Sparks of Reaſon and Conſcience which are the Effect and Gift of this great Light, Chriſt the Son of God, and Second Perſon of the Trinity, no leſſe than of the Father and Holy Ghoſt, are altogether natural and comprehenſible. Many places of Scripture beſide this they detort and deprave, to the end that by the Scriptures themſelves they may deſtroy the Scriptures, and prove that the light within, (which they being pitifully deluded, take for the Spirit of God,) is the Supream Rule of Faith and Manners; all which gloſſes fall to the ground, tho upon this one Account, that they have couched in them, this moſt dangerous and blaſphemous falſhood *viz.* that the dim and dark Light of nature, is not only ſufficient to guide us to Salvation, but (which ought to be heard with horror) is God himſelf. One of which Scriptures is John 14. 26, 27. and 16. 13. whence they would infer that all Believers are led by immediat objective Revelation, as the Apoſtles were, becauſe (ſay they) *the way that the Apoſtles were taught, which is by immediat* Reve*lation, is there holden forth as common to all Believers, and the words to(lead) and to (teach) in their proper and native ſignification denote always an immediat objective leading or teaching.* Thus Reaſoneth *Ro. Barclay, Vind.* pag. 19. 20. to which I anſwer, that theſe being two of the main places that he brought for proving the Spirit to be the principal Rule of Faith and Manners, he ought to have given ſome other thing, than bare aſſertions, if he had in good earneſt intended to overthrow what his Adverſary chap. 3. n. 27. ſaid againſt his meaning of theſe places, which he hath not in the leaſt done, for why may not immediat objective Revelation be promiſed to the Apoſtles in theſe places, and yet not unto all Believers, but ſubjective only, whereby they may underſtand and apply theſe Truths that were taught immediatly to the Apoſtles and Prophets, upon whoſe Doctrine the Faith of all Believers is founded as its principal Rule, and Foundation Epheſ. 2 20. Even as the like Phraſes hold forth an immediate objective Teaching to ſome, and yet that only which is meerly mediate as to others as Neh. 9. 20. comp. with v. 30. 1 Kings 8.

36. Pſal. 132. 12. *Deu.* 32. 12. Moreover that the words to [*lead*] and [*teach*] hold forth a mediate objective Teaching, or a ſubjective Illumination far oftner in Scripture than immediate objective Revelation, is manifeſt to any that are acquainted with the Scriptures, which if the *Quakers* deny, ſeing they are the opponents, they ought to condeſcend to a collation of places, and ſnew the contrary. Laſtly, whatever the *Quakers* ſay, we cannot help it, certain it is that no man of ſound Judgment will deny, that when one readeth the Scriptures, and hath his mind illuminated by the Spirit of God, that he may underſtand the wondrous things in Gods Law, but ſuch an one hath that promiſe of which we now ſpeak fulfilled unto him, and thus the only Scripture argument which R*obert Barclay* attempts to urge in his *Vindication*, falleth to the ground, for all the reſt of the Scriptures from which he deduced his Apologetick Arguments he ſlideth over, without any Vindication thereof, R*obert Barclay Apolog.* pag. 38. hath another Argument, which becauſe he complaineth, as if it were not ſufficiently ſolved by his adverſary chap. 3. numb. laſt. I will ſet down here, and anſwer formally, that there may be no juſt ground of Complaint, The Argument thus runs; *That unto which all* Profeſ*ſors of Chriſtianity of whatſoever kind, do at laſt recurr, and becauſe of which all other grounds, are commended and accounted worthy to be believed, muſt of neceſſity be the only* Rule, *moſt certain and immovable ground of all Chriſtian Faith, but the inward immediat objective Revelation of the Spirit is that* &c.

Ergo. Reſp. the Minor is ambiguous, and therefore moſt fallacious, for according to this kind of reaſoning, they may conclude, that a man juſt now poſſeſſing a piece of land formerly enjoyed by his Anceſtors, by Virtue of a Right granted to them by a Prince deceaſed many ages ago, ſpake mouth to mouth, with that Prince dead ages out of mind, Thus, that unto which the preſent Poſſeſſor of ſuch a piece of Land when preſſed to the laſt, recurreth unto, and for which other Grounds or Charters are commended or valid, muſt of neceſſity be the moſt immoveable ground of, and Warrand for his poſſeſſion of ſuch a piece of Ground; but the Grant and Donation of ſuch or ſuch a Prince given many ages ago, firſt by word of Mouth, tho again committted to writings, is that which the preſent Poſſeſſor being preſſed to the laſt recurreth to, Ergo the preſent Poſſeſſor had immediat Diſcourſe mouth to mouth with a Prince many ages back ere the preſent Poſſeſſor was born. Certainly theſe muſt be admirable Fellows who can conclude, and that in *modo & figura*, *quidlibet ex quolibet*, and thus their ſtrongeſt Arguments, ſerve only to prove the Authors to be in a paroxiſm of folly, moving laughter in a very *Heraclite*. But *ex abundante* I anſwer directly to this their blunt *Sophiſm*, tho forſooth the *Quakers* Achillean Argument; Thus, But inward, immediate objective Revelation is that to which all Chriſtians recur &c. this is inward, immediat objective in Reſpect of the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*, I grant; in Reſpect of the preſent Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, I deny, ny, and let them urge the *membrum negatum.* Of the like Nature is another, and that the chief of his Apologetick Arguments, viz. *Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and ſome others had immediate objective Revelation, therefore the whole Church had it*; the Conſequent his *Antagoniſt chap.* 3. *numb.* 11. denyeth, as not having the leaſt ſhadow of Reaſon, let us therefore ſee how he vindicateth this Argument which is a *ſine quo non* to the whole frame of *Quakeriſm*, and for this all that he ſayeth *Vindic*: pag. 24. is, "that then it ſeems there was more of Gods 'immediat Revelation in thoſe dark times, even by 'his Adverſaries Confeſſion, than now under the 'Goſpel, where the chief paſtors of the Church ac'cording to him, are to expect no ſuch thing: nei'ther is it proved that others not mentioned, had 'no immediat Revelations. Anſw. true it is that even in theſe dark times. there was in ſome reſpect viz. of immediate Revelations, more of God, than there is now, and yet leſſe in another ſenſe, viz. in reſpect of more large propagation of the Truth of God, and of the large Meaſure of Grace diſpenſed unto Believers under the *New Teſt*: But what ſayeth this to the probation of the *Quakers* tremulous conſequence? how doth it prove, that becauſe ſome few had theſe Revelations, all and every one within the Church had them? this is *a baculo ad angulum*, neither are we bound to prove the contrary *affirmanti enim incumbit probatio*: It is enough for us to tell him, that it is a groundleſs fancy to aſſert it, for how will he prove; ex. gr. that ever *Abel* had immediate objective Revelation? and thus the

third *Propoſition* of his ſecond Theſe, " that God
' did alwayes reveal himſelf by his Spirit, *i. e.* by
' immediate objective Revelation to every one of
' the Church, falleth to the Ground; and with it, the
fourth viz. " that theſe Revelations were, the
' formal object of the Faith of the Saints, for if it
be altogether groundleſs to ſay, that every Saint
had them, as we have now ſeen: it is no leſſe
groundleſſe to ſay, that they were the formal Object of their Faith, and with theſe alſo his fifth
Propoſition, viz. that *the ſame* i. e: *immediat* Revelation, *continueth to be the formal object of the Saints Faith.*

——— ea lapſa repente ruinam
Cum ſonitu trahit, & Tremulum ſuper agmina (*late*
Incidit.

Like the Trojan Tower, its couplings being
cutt, the whole Fabrick of *Quakeriſm*, tumbleth
down about the ears of its Authors, and builders,

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning Original Sin.

HAving canvaſſed the grand principle of the *univerſal* Light, *and ſpirit* of the *Quakers*, I ſhall conſider ſome of the chief points of their Religion, and lay open the abſurdity and blaſphemy thereof, that the Reader may the better judge of the root, having ſeen the Fruit, and of the *Baſis* by the *S*uperſtructure. The firſt of theſe ſhall be the doctrine of *Original Sin*, which they joyntly deny: aſſerting *that Adams Sin, can be imputed to none but himſelf, and therefore none are guilty of the tranſgreſſion of our firſt Parents, and ſo lyable to puniſhment until by their evil walking, or actual ſins, they become tranſgreſſors.* This Doctrine, although not ſo ancient as the Apoſtles and Prophets, yet is as old as the Doctrine of peſtiferous *Pelagius*, the firſt open aſſerter thereof, with *Celeſtius* his Diſciple. Hence all who denyed the Doctrine which now the reformed Churches hold anent Original ſin, were eſteemed guilty of *Pelagianiſm*; which notwithſtanding *Robert Barclay* : *Vind*: *ſect* 5. *Numb* 5. would fain deny, but to no purpoſe, except to contradict what he himſelf ſaid in his *Apology chap* 4. *where he granteth, that Auguſtin with whom all the Orthodox whollie agree in this* *point, did hold the ſame Doctrine with the Weſtminſter Confeſſion*, in oppoſition to the *Pelagians*, to which Confeſſion of his, tho now by himſelf retracted, or rather contradicted, I will add the words of *Vincentius* Lyrenenſis *chap* 35. *adverſus hæret:* cited by the Author of *Melius inquirendum*, *who before Cæleſtius the monſtrous Scholar of* Pelagius, *ever denyed that all mankind ſtood guilty of Adams apoſtacy from God?* Moreover, whoſoever will be at the pains to read the *Magdeburgick Hiſtory, centur.* 5. *colum.* 577, 588, 589, 590. And compare it with the Doctrine of the *Quakers* in this point, he will find an exact harmony, between them and the *Pelagians*, both in Doctrine, and Probation thereof. But we need add no more, ſeing Robert *Barclay*, in the place juſt now cited, after ſeveral ſerpentine windings and turnings, to the end he may (tho he retain the thing yet) evite the Name, wholly rejecteth *Auguſtin*, and therefore giveth up the Cauſe, ridiculouſly enquiring at his Adverſary, *if he will aſſert every thing that Auguſtin ſaid*, ridiculouſly (I ſay) ſeing the queſtion is, if *Auguſtin* did not hold our Doctrine anent Original Sin, as the *Antitheſis* to that of the *Pelagians* in this point, which *Pelagians* have had many ſucceſſors, tho known by other Names, as *Socinus*, and his School, and holy and pure *Anabaptiſts* (as they called themſelves) and were by contrariety of ſpeech, called by others, the Fry of a deluded *Enthuſiaſt*, *Thomas Muncer*; The horrid abominations of which ſect, and this their Doctrine of Original Sin among the reſt, that famous reformer *Bullinger*, hath by Scriptures and Reaſon, ſo hammered, that one in reaſon ſhould have thought, that it ſhould never have had a Reſurrection,as may be ſeen *Lib:*1. *cap* 11. *adverſus Anabaptiſtas,* where he alſo to purpoſe vindicateth *Zuinglius* from the calumny of the denyal of Original Sin, wherewith firſt the Council of *Trent,* although contrary to their own Light, as judicious *Soave* obſerveth,and of late *Rob:* *Barclay,* both in his *Apology and Vindication,* hath traduced him.

Secondly , Altho this Doctrine hath by many Ages been aſſaulted moſt fiercely, by corrupt men, both of ſubtile wit and earneſtneſs of Intention, yet the providence of God hath ſufficiently preoccupied , what they have ſaid or can ſay, and fortified all who truly believe what God hath ſaid in His Word, where there is good Store both of Sword and Buckler , for managing of this War; and of theſe many I ſhall here excerpt and vindicate a few. And Firſt, *Gen.* 2. 17. *For in the Day thou Eateſt thou ſhall ſurely Die*, or Dying thou ſhalt Die,where is a clear proof of our Doctrine,whence we reaſon , as well againſt *Pelagians, Anabaptiſts, Socinians* and *Quakers,* as againſt the *Papiſts,* who deny Original ſin in Infants after Baptiſm ; Thus: *Infants* Die, *Ergo* they are guilty of Original Sin, ſeeing according to this preſent Text,Death is the puniſhment due to the breach of the Command. To this the *Pelagians*,as *Auguſtin* in ſeveral places,and particularlie *Queſt.* 3. *C.*899-tom 4. colum. *666.* And the *Socinians* , as *Pareus* on the place ſheweth, with other Enemies of the Chriſtian Religion, and at this day the *Quakers* anſwer, *that Bodily death is not included in this Threatning*; But beſides that the *Pelagians* were anathematized for this doctrine by one Council of *Carthage*, conſiſting of 224 Biſhops *Photius Biblioth. Colum.* 42. This anſwer is evidently falſe, ſeeing that by this word (*Death*) frequently in Scripture, Bodily as well as Spiritual, is underſtood, and by the Phraſe, *to die the Death*, the ſeparation of Soul and Body is frequently holden forth: Moreover none can deny that Bodily Death of it ſelf is an evil, and no evil could have befallen Mankind perſevering in the State of Innocency; But *Chap.* 3. 19. Will abundantly diſſolve all doubts about the meaning of the text to any unbyaſſed Men: Where God himſelf, deſcribing the puniſhment of Adams tranſgreſſion, denounceth and foretelleth his return to the duſt, as not the leaſt part thereof. But we need not multiply reaſons for the vindication of this text, ſeeing none, except *Socinians* and *Pelagians*, oppoſe our meaning thereof, and the reaſon adduced by our preſent adverſaries, common to them with the *Socinians*, and in particular *Crellius*, for its overthrown, in ſtrength excelleth not a cobweb, although they pitched upon it, as the only weapon, which had any Teeth or keenneſs therein; The reaſon is, *Adam died not that day that he did eat, therefore* (ſay they) *Bodily death is not Comprehended in the threatning*: Neither hath this reaſon any ſtronger nerves than the reſt uſed by *Pelagians* & *Socinians*, which yet for ought any thing I can find, the *Quakers* do not uſe, judging them (as it ſeems)

un-

unfit to ſerve their turn ; Therefore R*obert* B*ar*-*clay* tho he had *Apolog:* chap 4. Fought with this Reaſon as the only prop of his cauſe ; his adverſary chap. 5. num. 8. *Having hewed it in pieces*) in his *Vindication* eſſayeth not the reinforcement thereof, only *Sect.* 5. num. 3. In ſtead of a Vindication hath its repetition, adding,that death as it is now circumſtantiated with *S*ickneſs and the like miſeries , is a conſequence, but not a puniſhment of Sin,which diſtinction is moſt *B*laſphemous, as here it is made uſe of, ſeing it inſinuateth that God Tranſgreſſeth his own Law, by inflicting more miſerie on fallen man, than was denounced in the Threatning. Either this he muſt ſay , or elſe that Sickneſs, and Death , as they are now circumſtantiated , are not inflicted by God , which *I* am ſure is little better than the former. But to ſhut up all, he ſayeth, *that his Adverſarie hath not ſaid enough, to proſelyte him to his Opinion* , notwithſtanding that he had ſo daſhed his reaſon, upon which it was builded , that the *Quaker* attempteth not the Reſtauration thereof : He addeth further as a reaſon why his Adverſary had not ſaid enough to proſelyte him,*that death to Adam in the ſtate of Innocency ſhould have been a pleaſure & not a pain* ; which reaſon is altogether reaſonleſſe, ſeeing the reaſon why death is pleaſant to any , is its being the port to free Men from all evil,& eſpecially from *S*in,without which Adam ſhould have wholly remained,if he had perſevered in his integrity; but it is too evident, that the *Quaker* is of *Bellarmins* mind who *de ſtatu primi Hominis*, alledgeth that *man during his Integrity was not free of concupiſcence and evil inclinations*; which doctrine maketh God the Author of ſin. But I leave this matter, only I cannot but here obſerve, which I might do in moſt places and weightieſt points of *Robert Barclay's Vindication*; that *per fas aut nefas* (as they ſay) the *Quakers* muſt have the laſt words; for who will think it requiſite to write after one, who can tell his Adverſary that he hath not ſaid enough to proſelyte him, and yet never ſo much as eſſay to vindicate his own, or remove his adverſaries reaſons, as *Robert Barclay* doth here, and yet publiſhes his book to the world, as a ſufficient anſwer or refutation of what his adverſarie had ſaid, living in the mean time without ſo much as an attempted vindication, theſe points with which the whole frame of *Quakeriſm* ſtandeth and falleth; for if Bodily death was included in the threatning, then our doctrine of Original ſin is proved, which doctrine once being evinced, all the pretended abſurdities and blaſphemies, which *Socinians*, *Quakers* and others infer from our Doctrine of Original ſin and Reprobation, fall to the Ground, and they are, if they be Chriſtians, obliged to remove theſe themſelves. Further its clear from Rom. 6. 23. *The wages of ſin is Death*, where death without exception of any kind of death is called the wages, not the conſequence only of ſin, as the *Quaker* both in his *Apology* and *Vindication* Sect. 5. num. 8. in contradiction to the expreſs Text, expoundeth it; neither is his reaſon more weightie, than his expoſition is ſound, which is, *that the whole*

Creation received a decay by Adams fall, and yet Herbs and Trees are not to be called ſinners, ſeeing the Apoſtle is not here ſpeaking of herbs and trees, but of Men Women who are capable of receiving the wages of ſin, as being the workers thereof, and certainly one may with the like reaſon, ſay that Herbs and Trees are capable of eternal life as that they may be capable of the wages of Sin. *H*is other ſhift which he hath *Ibid:* by which alſo he deſtroyes the former, viz. *that by death is not to be underſtood Bodily Death, becauſe Eternal* Life *is put as the Oppoſite of the death here ſpoken of, and obtained by Chriſt Jeſus, and yet natural death is not avoided*, is not much better then the former, ſeeing that after the reſurrection, the Bodies of the Godlie, ſhall live as well as their ſouls, and the reunion of both doth belong to Eternal *L*ife, and ſo natural *L*ife is comprehended in Eternal Life, as well as Spiritual Life; and tho believers die a *Bo*dily Death, yet it is not a puniſhment to them, on this account that the Sting and *B*itterneſs thereof is removed by Chriſt, who did bear the ſame, otherwiſe death is in it ſelf a puniſhment, being the ſeparation of Soul and Body, the moſt ſtrictly united friends and companions in the World.

3ly. Our Doctrine of *Original* Sin is clearlie convinced from Rom. 5. 12. *As by one Man, Sin entered into the World and Death by Sin*, &c. together with the following verſes; whence diverſe ſtrong arguments may eaſily be collected, for 1. The Apoſtle that he may prove juſtification not to be by works but by Faith, or the imputed righte

cou

eouſneſs of Chriſt; maketh a compariſon betwixt the two common Heads or Repreſentatives, Adam and Chriſt, in this, that both of them repreſented the parties related to them, the ſame way, ſo that Adam was a Type of Chriſt in his ſtanding in the room of one partie as Chriſt did in the Room of another, *by bearing of their Iniquities* Iſa. 53. 11. By *being made ſin for them*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. (i. e.) by Imputation thereof unto him, for no otherwiſe this text can be underſtood without Blaſphemie;) *that they may be made the* Righteouſneſs *of God in Him*, i. e. by imputation of it to them, as their Sin was imputed to him; Therefore Adam the Type, ſtood in the name and Room of Mankind, ſo as his doings or failings were imputed to them. *Robert Barclay Vindication*, Sect. 5. numb. 7. Alledgeth that this compariſon ſpoileth all our doctrine, *becauſe if the Righteousneſs of Chriſt is not to be imputed to men for Juſtification, untill they actually joyn with it apprehended by Faith, ſo neither is the unrighteouſneſs and diſobedience of Adam, imputed to Men for Condemnation, untill they actually joyn with it.* But I wonder not to ſee a man intending by right or wrong to Stick to his preconceived opinions, make uſe of Fig-leaf defences, when he can find no other: For may not Children before they come to the uſe of Reaſon, be juſtified and Saved by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed unto them, and by conſequence, others before the uſe of reaſon ſtand guilty of Adams ſin imputed to them, which is the Concluſion he fain would evite. Moreover he may as well ſay, that Adams Sin doth not at all hurt any of his poſterity, untill they having the uſe of reaſon, actually joyn with it, which yet he no where ſayeth, but granteth the contrary in ſeveral places of this Section. 3ly. *Omne ſimile claudicat*, this parallel ought not neceſſarily, to be ſtretched to every particular mode and circumſtance, but only to the particular which is intended here, viz. the Imputation of what the two common repreſentatives did or ſuffered, unto the parties repreſented by them; but the *Quakers* have Learned B*ellarmin's* Art, who by racking of this Parallel thought to overthrow our Doctrine of Juſtification by faith. 2. The Sin of Adam is ſuch, that if this Text have any ſenſe at all, by this Sin of his, all have ſinned, and by it Death without exception is brought upon all Mankind. 3. It is ſuch a ſin of which they are guilty who have not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam, ſeeing death reigned over them, for death can reign over none but Guilty perſons, but Infants are ſubject to Death, tho they have not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam, i. e. by actual tranſgreſſion, Ergo *In*fants are guilty of Adams ſin. 4. This Offence of Adams was of ſuch a nature, that the Guilt of it, or judgement flowing therefrom, came upon all the partie repreſented by him, to the condemnation thereof, i. e. (if it be any thing) ſo that this party ſtood really condemned thereby. v. 18. But all Mankind were repreſented by Adam, Ergo all Men are condemned by the ſin of Adam imputed to them: To this R*obert Barclay* anſwereth Vind, pag, 101. *That Judgment or Guilt is not ex-*

preſſed in the Original, which is true, but while he ſayeth, *it ought not to be ſupplied*, one would expect that he ſhould give a better anſwer, which I looked for; but all that he giveth, *is an individuum vagum* [*S*omething] which ſupplement denudeth the Text of ſenſe, making a *Welſhmans* hoſe thereof; therefore certainly there can be no other thing underſtood, but either *Judgement*, as our Tranſlation hath it, or *Condemnation*, as the verſion of Tremellius out of the *Syriak*, or *Guilt*, as *Beza*: Seeing the effect thereof was the condemnation of the whole party repreſented by *A*dam, as the Text clearlie ſheweth. But to declare his Harmonie with R*ome* he followeth the *Verſio Vulgata*, which in this place hath non-ſenſe ſupplying nothing. From all that is ſaid, I argue thus, that ſin which is deſcribed to us by the *A*poſtle, that he ſaith brought death upon all Men, that men Sinned by it, and were made Sinners, even they who could not as yet actually ſin, that they all became Guilty of Death and condemnation; that *S*in by imputation is the ſin of the whole Nature, included in *A*dam, and rendreth the whole nature obnoxious to death and condemnation; but the firſt Sin of *A*dam is thus deſcribed to us by the *A*poſtles, *&c.* Ergo, that ſin is the ſin of Nature, *&c.* R*obert* B*arclay* denyeth the Major of this argument, and that to the admiration of all L*ogicians*, ſeeing no connexion can be clearer in the World, as might eaſily appear to any that conſider it; for who can deny (not to mention other Members of this *A*rgument) that if theſe who had not actually ſinned, are made ſinners by this Tranſgreſſion of *Adam*, then this is the *Sin* of the whole Nature, or imputed to it, which is our Doctrine of Original *Sin*; who I ſay will deny this? *Seeing* there is no other thing in the conſequence then in the antecedent, except a variation of words and Phraſes holding forth the ſame thing, which yet cannot be counted a *Tautology* in ſtrict *Syllogiſtical* argumentation, the ſcope of which is to evince the ſame ſenſe by a clearer phraſiology or way of ſpeaking. 2. He ſayeth that in this argumentation, *words not in the Text are foiſted in*, viz. *they who have not actually ſinned*: But in this he only bewrayeth his Own and his *Brethrens* capital error, *that the Scriptures ought not to be interpreted or reaſoned from*; for his adverſary uſed only this argument as a clear deduction from the Text, & yet becauſe it is not in ſo many words in the Text, he rejecteth it; yea he ſaith Ibid. *let him ſhew me the place of Scripture that ſaith that Infants are guilty of Adams ſin.* Behold, Reader, how the *Quakers* new light hath extinguiſhed the light of ſound reaſon, and provided for their anceſtors the *Sadducees* a ſhield, ſuch as it is, to ward off the argument of our Saviour, whereby He to purpoſe proved the *Reſurection* from the dead; but had *Robert Barclay* been there, he had given him more ado, by ſaying, *ſhew me the plain Scripture that ſayeth the dead ſhall riſe again*: Moreover we ſay that this followeth clearly from theſe words, *in whom all have ſinned*. To this he anſwereth, *that it is to be underſtood of all that could ſin*, i. e. actuallie having come to the uſe of reaſon; but this

an

anſwer hath in its boſom a blaſphemous falſhood that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, cannot be imputed to *Infants*, and therefore that they are not ſaved by him only; and come to *Heaven* throw his Righteouſneſs, for whatever he ſay for the defence of this his anſwer, doth of its own accord tend to the protection of this Blaſphemy; for altogether with the like reaſon, it might be replyed to any pleading from this Chapter that the Juſtification and Salvation of Infants is to be aſcribed to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; that theſe are only righteous for the Righteousneſs of Chriſt, who could be righteous, i. e. After the uſe of reaſon actually joyned themſelves to that Righteouſneſs. 2. He may as well ſay, that theſe received hurt and damage by the ſin of Adam, who could receive it, i. e. actually join themſelves to it, for there is alike reaſon for both. His reaſon why Infants cannot ſin is, becauſe *they are under no Law*, for the proof whereof, he refers me to what he has ſaid above, whither with him *I* will return, which is num. 4. where he requireth in *what Countries they uſe to kill all the Children whoſe Fathers are put to death for their crimes*? To which I reply, 1. That it is enough to prove Children to be under a Law, that tho in non-age or unborn, they undergo forfeiture and deprivation of Goods and priviledges, for no evil of their own, but their Fathers miſdemeanors only. 2. Both in divine and humane writing, Children are recorded to have ſuffered death, who had committed no actual ſin, and yet ſuffered the ſame puniſhment with their Fathers who had actually ſinned: *In* divine ſtory, the *Sodomites* I am ſure were put to death for their crimes, all whoſe Children were killed with them Gen. 19. Behold, reader, how eaſily his moſt perplexing queſtions are reſolved. The like fell out to the Children of *Core* Numb. 16. The Children of *Achan* Joſ. 7. and to the *Canaanitiſh* Infants; the Children of *Benjamin*; the inhabitants of *Jabeſh-Gilead*: of the like examples humane Hiſtories are full, of which the reader may ſee good ſtore collected by that excellent divine *Turret. in vol. 1. loco 9. Queſt 9. pag. 671.* I am ſure there is nothing more common than for Kings or Common-wealths to ſack the Cities and Countries of Obſtinate rebells, and thus to deſtroy the Children with the Fathers, and to kill the hoſtages of Covenant-breakers, without reſpect & regard to their age, examples of which ſee in *Livie decade tertia.* 3. If in any point of Religion and Faith, the admirable depth of the judgment and *S*ecret *C*ounſel of God, be to be ſeen, certainly it is be obſerved here; for I am ſure Mans luxuriant reaſon, can find ſo much to object againſt even the very inherent corruption of Man, his miſeries tho in non-age, and his deprivation of the image of God, as being the effects or ſure conſequence of Adams eating of the forbidden fruit, as may ſend the anſwerer to P*auls* Sanctuarie Rom. 9. 20. *Who art thou &c.* We anſwer therefore, 1. That Adam was a publick perſon, ſtanding and falling in the Room of his poſterity, in whoſe name and behalf, the Covenant of works was made with him as their repreſentative, ſo that his firſt ſin was not perſonal,but the ſin of the whole Nature: To this Robert *Barclay* replyeth num. 6. requiring Mr.B*rown to prove by plain Scriptures, that Adam ceaſed to be a publick perſon after he had committed his firſt ſin.* Anſwer, he denyeth not, if this be proved, but that our Doctrine of Original ſin will ſtand, for ſo much he here inſinuateth; I therefore with the more chearfulneſs prove, that Adam did ceaſe to be a publick perſon, which is evident from this, that he died in that day he did eat, and therefore made the Covenant void and null, now certainly no Man with reaſon can ſay, that a Man dead in *Law*, as Adam was after the breach of the Covenant by eating, can in his future actions be a publick perſon, in reſpect of the ſame Law broken by eating; Therefore ſeing the day he did eat, did put a term to this Covenant of *Life* (as no man with reaſon can deny it) and a period to this common headſhip, for the one of theſe ſtandeth and falleth reciprocallie with the other; it is clear and manifeſt to all, that *A*dam after his fall was no more a publick perſon. Moreover the ſin of *A*dam whereby we were damnified, is ſtill holden forth as one, and not as many ſins; as for example Rom.5. All along in the compariſon betwixt Chriſt, and Adam. *Robert Barclay* replyeth, “that “we may as well hence conclude; that we are only juſtified by the firſt act of Chriſts obedi“ence, and ſo have nothing to do with Chriſts death “and ſufferings. But by his favour *Bonum oritur ex integra cauſa, Malum autem ex defectu quovis.* The Scriptures every where, and in particular Iſa. 53. throughout expreſs a long ſeries of doings and ſufferings agreed upon in the Covenant of Redemption , none of which could be wanting for the fulfilling of the bargain and accompliſhment of our Salvation : Whereas on the otherhand,one defect in Adam was enough to compleat (ſo to ſpeak) his fall, and make the breach of the Covenant, it being an evil thing, for the makeing of which one defect is enough. *A*nd thus his *Gordian* , and inſoluble knot (for ſo he accounteth it) is with all eaſineſs untyed. *B*ut we need not inſiſt on this, ſeing he endeavoureth to *S*hreud himſelf, under the covert of his accuſtomed antiſcriptural dottage, calling for plain Scripture; that is, That Adam was a publick perſon before his fall, in ſo many Letters, and *Syllables*,knowing well that unleſs underproped with ſuch dammable hypotheſes his *Doctrine* cannot ſtand ; but he buyeth bad Wares at a full dear price, for with the ſame breath he overthroweth both his own *Apology*, and *Vindication*, with whatſoever beſide he has written in the defence of his principles ; ſeeing theſe are not found in the Scriptures in ſo many *Letters*,& Syllables:But I again return to his ſeventh number, and in it next he alleadgeth *Auguſtin* as the Patron of his opinion, in contradiction to his own *Apology Chap.* 4. Where he granted *Auguſtin to be of the ſame Opinion with his Adverſary,acknowledging that according to the mind of Auguſtin , Infants even before their birth are Guilty of Eternal Death , and the pains of Hell.* Thus he either ſpeaketh ſelf contradictions, or would make *Auguſtin* to do it. 2. The words of *Auguſtin*, from which he would conclude this ſelf contradiction are theſe *Serm.* 7. *Ex verb. Apoſtoli*, "what do ye think to ſay? And whoſe eares can hear it? Did they ſin themſelves? Where I pray you did they ſin? When and how did they ſin? They know neither good nor evil. Shall they ſin that are under no Command? Prove that Infants are ſinners, prove what is their Sin, is it becauſe they weep, that they ſin? Do they Sin, becauſe they take pleaſure, or repell trouble by motion, as dumb Animals? If theſe motions be ſin, they become greater ſinners in *B*aptiſm, for they reſiſt moſt vehemently. But I ſay another thing. You think they have ſinned; otherwiſe they had not dyed, but what ſay ye of ſuch as die in there Mothers womb? Will you ſay they have ſinned alſo? You Lye, or are deceived. &c." Thus *Auguſtin* in oppoſition to the *Pelagians*, who to evite the force of the arguments of the Orthodox proving Original ſin, did aſſert, *that Children preſently after their birth become actual Sinners.* And yet from this the *Quaker* will conclude that *Auguſtin* in theſe words contradicteth his own doctrine of *I*nfants being guilty of Original Sin; of which there is not the leaſt appearance, ſeing this will be admirable *Logick* to inferr from *Auguſtin* his proving of Infants not to be guilty of actual ſin, therefore he denyed them to be guilty of Original ſin: Now what would not theſe Men adventure to ſay in the dark, when they are ſo audacious, as to publiſh to the world in print, that *Auguſtin* denyed Infants to be guilty of Original ſin, when his own works do every where, and the World proclaim the contrary: yea and the *Quaker* himſelf alſo confeſſed it. Here he alledgeth that the Apoſtle no where ſayeth that Children, are under any Law; which is true, if he underſtand it in ſo many words, which yet notwithſtanding may be gathered from the 13. and 14. verſes of this Chapter, where the Apoſtle having ſaid, *That there is no Sin, where there is no* Law, ſubjoyneth that nevertheleſs *Death*, (which *I* have in my former Section, proved to be a puniſhment) *reigned even over theſe who had not ſinned after the* Similitude *of Adam*: Which holdeth true of Children who never ſinned actually as *Adam* did. When he ſeeth that it cannot be denyed, that in this place ἐφ' ᾧ is of the ſame meaning with ἐν ᾧ he would have ᾧ to repeat θανατος making the words to run thus, I*n which, or by occaſion of which, death, all have ſinned.* A Pelagian expoſition, makeing men ſin by imitation only, and the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be the occaſion, and patern only; and not the price of our acceptation, and Salvation. And altho he ſay, that *this is reſolved by a ſerious conſideration of the compariſon between Chriſt and Adam, as ſtated by him in his Apology.* This is not to be regarded, ſeing after an impartial ſearch, nothing of this reſolution can be perceived: *He* ought therefore to have ſhewed us, how in particular he had in his *Apology* preoccupied our argument, whereby they are proved to be amongſt the groſſeſt of *Socinians*, who make the death and ſufferings of Chriſt an occaſion; or example only whereby to walk, and ſo to be ſaved: But not at all the procuring cauſe of Salvation, but *Ultra poſſe non datur eſſe.* But indeed this is a fine way of Vindicating ones Doctrine, to ſay in oppoſition to their Adverſaries argument how preſſing ſoever, in the general only, you do not underſtand our doctrine aright, or conſider what we ſay. And upon this anſwer only erect his Triumphal Arches, and Cry *Victoria.*

4. Our Doctrine is to the conviction of all, except of the Old and New *Pelagians*, evicted from *Eph* 2, 3. and yet *Rob: Barclay* (following *Bellarmin*, who played the like audacious pranks with *Rom.*4. whereby we evince againſt the *Papiſts*, Juſtification to be by Faith) would turn our weapons againſt our ſelves, and overthrow from this place our Doctrine of Original Sin, alledging that *Mens evil walking, is the cauſe why they are counted the children of Wrath*: But if the Apoſtle had ſo meaned, in all likelyhood, he ſhould not have ſpoken ſo generally as he did; but had made ſome Intimation, that Children were excepted, which he neither here, nor any where elſe doeth: 2. This Phraſe *by Nature*, is ſtill taken in *Scripture*, for, ſo ſoon as a thing hath a beeing, or for its very riſing, or Original: which theſe Scriptures confirm. Rom: 2. 27. and 11, 24. Gal, 2.5. and 4.8. 1 Cor. 15.44, 46. Hence we thus with *Calvin*, in oppoſition to the *Pelagians*, on the place reaſon "What is naturally " in every one, is in them from their very Original; " and therefore if all be the Children of Wrath, or "ob-

'obnoxious to wrath by Nature, they are ſo from 'their very Original. Theſe Scriptures, and this Argument of *Calvin* uſed by his Adverſary *Robert Barclay* in his *Vind.* Is ſo far from attempting to anſwer, that he maketh not the leaſt mention thereof. From which one Omiſſion, though there were no more, any may eaſily ſee, that his book deſerveth nothing leſs than the name of a *Vindication.*

3. We add as a good ſecondary Confirmation, that the *primitive Church* uſed ſtill this place to prove the ſame Doctrine, which we hold of Original ſin, in oppoſition to the *Pelagians*, denying it; and in particular *Auguſtin de Fide ad Petram diaconum* Cap. 26. who ſayeth *firmiſſime tene, hold moſt conſtantly, and without ſo much as once wavering, that every one who is conceived by the conjunction of man and woman, is born with Original ſin, under the power of ungodlineſs, ſubject to death,* (which he explaineth of eternal, as well as bodily death, Ibid) *and upon the ſame very account a Child of wrath, concerning which the Apoſtle ſaith, and we were by nature the Children of wrath.* And the like Doctrine, did *Fulgentius*, and fourteen biſhops with him aſſert, as alſo *Theodoretus*, *Primaſius* and *Haimo* on the place, taking *by nature &c.* to import all carnally born, and partaking of the nature of *Adam*, and ſo to be verified of all brought forth by the conjunction of man and woman. To this argument drawn from Orthodox antiquity, *Rob. Barcl. Vind.* Sect. 2. N 5. replyeth, *what then? would that render our doctrine null?* *Anſwer*, Not

in-

made

indeed to a *Pelagian*; which every where, and in ſpecial here by his open Patrociny of this Hereſy, he fully demonſtrateth himſelf to be, notwithſtanding that at other times he would fain deny himſelf to be one, ſtudying to evite the name, tho he hug their blaſphemy. Their anſwer to our Argument drawn from *Pſal.* 51. 5. *I was ſhapen in iniquity &c.* Which by all the Orthodox, both primitive writers, as *Auguſtin paſſim*, and the *Reformers*, as *Luther*, in his Confeſſion is underſtood of Original ſin, is moſt ſtrange, *viz* That *David ſpeaketh of the ſin of his Mother, and not of his own*. To which it is replyed that thus the marriage duty ſhall de condemned. To this *Rob.Barclay*, *Vind*: Sect 5 N 7. returneth a denyal of the inference; which yet is clear; ſeing wherever in all the Scriptures, any did bewail the ſins of their progenitors, they ſtill ſpecified and pointed at the ſin in particular, as *Neh.* 9. with many other places; but here if any particular fact be ſpecified, it muſt needs be that of the Marriage duty, therefore the inference holdeth good, & here I cannot but take notice of one of his pungent anſwers, or rather queſtions (if ye will) Which he propoſeth *ubi modo* in theſe words, *And I deſire yet to be informed of him in what Scripture he reads of Original ſin, and whether, if the Scripture be the only* Rule, *he cannot find words fit enough to expreſs his* Faith? *or muſt he ſhift for them elſe where?* Thus he, but in Lieu of theſe, I return him another queſtion, and deſire to be informed of him, whether or not he readeth of *Actual ſin*, or findeth this in ſo many words? Behold then Reader! the deſperate tendency of *Quakeriſm*, which is to make men beleive that there is no ſin at all mentioned in the Scriptures, and therefore, not at all prohibited: For ſeing on the account that the phraſe Original ſin, is not found in Scriptures, he denyeth our Doctrine how clear ſo ever it be proved, by Scriptural deductions: he giveth good ground to another, for inferring *ad hominem*, that there is not ſuch a thing as Actual ſin, ſeing the phraſe Actual ſin, is no where in Scripture to be found, more than that phraſe *Original ſin*.

The ſame Truth may be yet further demonſtrated by ſeveral other pregnant arguments. As firſt,

Infants for the ſin of *Adam*, are deprived of the Image of God therefore there is no reaſon to deny, that they can be accounted guilty of his ſin. The Antecedent is denyed by none of our preſent Adverſaries. The Conſequence is alſo firm, for its a puniſhment, yea, the greateſt of puniſhments, equal with, if not greater than the torments of hell, to be deprived of the Image of God, and therefore of his comfortable preſence, Communion, Love, and Favour. 2. The Scripture is ignorant of any perſons that go to Heaven, except theſe that were guilty perſons, theſe whoſe ſin Chriſt did bear: *Er*: Children who have never committed Actual ſin, are guilty before *God*. The Conſequence is beyond all exceptions. The Antecedent alſo remaineth firm, until our Adverſaries adduce ſome place of Scripture, ſhewing that ſome perſons who never were guilty go to Heaven, or are ſaved without the merits of Chriſt. Moreover, it is clear from the whole tenor of the Scriptures, that none are ſaved but ſinners; which was Chriſts errand to the Earth; but the Scripture no where maketh any diſtinction, betwixt guilty perſons, and ſinners: and no where ſayeth, that any are ſaved, but theſe whoſe ſins Chriſt did bear, and one would in reaſon think, that this can leaſt of all men, be denyed by our Adverſaries, who aſſert that Chriſt died for all men without exception: Therefore if Infants be not guilty, there is no reaſon to ſay, that Chriſt died for them, or did bear their ſins, therefore we with all reaſon enquire, which our Adverſaries according to their principles can never be able to anſwer, how Infants, if not guilty come to heaven, without the Death, and Merits of Chriſt? They are altogether void of reaſon, while they with *Rob: Barcl.* for want of a better anſwer enquire, *How theſe whom we account Elect Infants come to Heaven?* Seing our reply is at hand, *viz:* that they are acquited before God, by the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

3. Certain it is from the whole tenor of the Scriptures, and in ſpecial *Rev*, 22. 15. That theſe who in the ſight of God are dogs, are guilty perſons, and to be excluded from Heaven, and therefore to be thruſt into Hell, but whole Nations without any exception are ſuch. *Matth.* 15. 26. Therefore Infants being a part of theſe Nations, deſerve to be excluded from Heaven, and ſent to Hell. Add to this, that ſome Children are ſaid by the *Apoſtle,* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. To be altogether deſtitut of Holineſs,

which

which perſons, *Heb.*12. 14. So long as they are ſo, cannot ſee God. Some of the Fathers in order to prove the Guilt of Infants, flowing from *Adams* tranſgreſſion, made uſe of *Gen.* 17. 14. *The man-child that is uncircumciſed, ſhall be cut off.* This Deduction of ſome of the Ancients Mr: *Broun* mentioneth *pag* 132. But expreſly telling, that he will not urge it, but inferreth notwithſtanding from this place, that Children may be in ſome ſenſe capable of breach of Covenant; and therefore under a Law, deſiring his Adverſary to chew his cud upon this inference, which if true, overthroweth all this Socinian Doctrine anent Original ſin, which ſtill preſuppoſeth, that Children are under no Law. For reply to which *Rob*: *Barcl. Vind* pag 62. introduceth Mr. *Broun* as if he had willed him, to chew his cud on this firſt deduction, viz. that, of ſome of the Fathers; paſſing by the ſecond, *viz* Mr. *Brouns* own inference, without ſo much as mentioning thereof; whereby he declareth that it hath broken his Jaws, or at beſt, is not yet digeſted.

4. *None can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven except they be born again. Joh.* 3. 7. But ſurely this new-birth, or to be born again, is the gift of God, and a priviledge which he may withhold from whom he will, and therefore without prejudice to his juſtice, may exclude whoſoever hath it not, from the Kingdom of Heaven, but none are excluded from it, but guilty perſons, which I believe none will deny, therefore Infants may well be accounted guilty perſons.

6. The main Objection, and that for any thing I know, upon which the bulk of all their Objections dependeth, againſt our Doctrine of Original ſin, the *Socinians* and *Quakers* draw from *Ezek.* 18, 20. *The Son ſhall not bear the Fathers iniquity &c.* Hence they infer, *That no ſin can be imputed.* To which it is anſwered, that this will not follow, ſeing the Lord is there ſtopping the mouth of the wicked, but yet querulous *Jews*, as tho they had been altogether guiltleſs themſelves, and puniſhed for their Fathers tranſgreſſions only ; To whom the Lord aſſerteth that they had ſin enough themſelves ; for which they might be puniſhed, & doth not at all ſay, that no ſin can be imputed to another, this meaning we ſay, beſide that it is evident from the Context, muſt of neceſſity be admitted, otherwiſe there ſhall be a flat contradiction between this, and many other texts. As for example the *ſecond Command*. This text *Mr. Brown* pag 119. cleared, and everted what the *Quakers* had ſaid from this place ; therefore he in his *Vindication pag* 55. not being in caſe to force the text, to ſpeak for him again, ſaith *the words are plain. The Son ſhall not die for the Fathers iniquity. And therefore they muſt ſtand to the overthrow of his Adverſaries Doctrine.* Such a Combatant as this is not fit for a ſecond eſſay.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of GOD.

IN this Chapter, I ſhall prove the *Quakers* guilty of three things, each of which, is enough to Unchriſtian the maintainer thereof. 1. That they deny the holy *Trinity* with *Arrins* and *Sabelians*. 2 That their Doctrine maketh God the Author of Sin. 3. That they hold the Soul of *Man* to be God.

Firſt, we ſhall evince, that this *Sect* really denyeth the *Trinity* of perſons in the God-head; and is as abominable, if not more, as the old *Arrians*, *Sabellians*, *Macedonians*, or the latter *Arrians*, as the *Socinians*. And in the firſt place, we ſhall give you the words of *George Fox*, a Quaker of great note, in his “ Primer to Europe, pag. 37. What is “ the Trinity in Unity? and whether all theſe words be not of mens Wiſdom and Teaching? *Anſ.* To every particular Query & word that is queried of you here, and what was their firſt ground and “ root, and to the light bring it out, and the firſt “ Author of them, and whether or no all this body “ hath not gotten up ſince the Apoſtacy, in the tranſgreſſion, where mens wiſdom teacheth words, “ and the words the Holy Ghoſt teacheth, is fooliſh-

“neſs to them. Whether or not this is ſo? Anſwer me, yea, or no? *What are the three Perſons in the Trinity? How are the three Perſons, ſubſiſtences of the Deity? How is the Trinity not the number numbering, but the number numbered? How is the opinion of the Trinity not only a Church Tradition, but a Doctrine expreſſed in the Scriptures?*

How is the word Hypoſtaſis, *which you acknowledge any ſingular Subſtance, uſed* Metaleptically? *or by taking one thing for another, for a perſon.* Heb, 1. 2. *Since ye ſay, a perſon is a ſingular, rational, and compleat Subſtance, and differing from another by an incommunicable property? Anſwer me this, and all the Terms, and Words, and* Queries, *and things before mentioned. What be the Wiſdom that hath taught them, and Ground, and* Root *they are come from? And whether or not they have all come up amongſt Chriſtians, ſince the days of the Apoſtles? And learned of the* Heathens *that knew not God, that tranſgreſſed the life, that had nothing but their own Wiſdom to teach them, who was taught by their own Wiſdom, and whether that is not pleaſing to a carnal man that knows not the things of God How are the* Words, Perſons, Trinity *ὁμοούσιον which ye grant, are not found in ſo many Syllables in the Scriptures, yet agree thereto?*

And *George Keith in his* Quak: No Popery pag 47. 104. Sayeth, that, *To ſpeak of Perſons in the God-head, is an uncertain, unſcriptural Notion, and a barbarous heathniſh Terme.*

The Doctrine and Principles of the Prieſts in Scotland, pag 19, 20. *It is a lie that the Scripture doth declare of the three perſons, or of the Trinity.* Add to all this, that in all their Treatiſes, there is nothing found concerning the *Holy* Trinity, except enough of this kind of Doctrine, of which we have given the Reader a taſte.

I will in the ſecond place ſhew, that this Doctrine is all one, if not worſe, with the Doctrine of the execrable *Arrians*; For their Doctrine was, *That the Son is ſeparated, or divided from the Eternal, and Ineffable Subſtance of God the Father*. In oppoſition to which, The Council of *Nice*, ſayes, chap 1. in their *Symbol*, That the Son is ὁμουσιον, i. e. of the ſame individual Subſtance with the Father, *Rufin. lib.* 1. Now it is to be obſerved, whoever hitherto contradicted the Doctrine of this *Nicen Symbol*, were accounted by all Chriſtians, *Arrians*. And upon this ground, abominated by the whole Church *Cane pejus et angue*, as they ſpeak Next, I aſſert, that whoſoever denyed that the Son was ὁμουσιος *Patri*, that is, of the ſame individual Subſtance with the Father, were by all the Orthodox counted *Arrians*, So that in that unhappy Council of *Ariminum*, when the *Arrian* Biſhops had deceived ſome of the ſimpler ſort, through their Sophiſtry, and made them through their own ſimplicity and ignorance of the Greek-tongue, to grant that the Son was not ὁμουσιος *Patri*, they were judged to involve them in the profeſſion of *Arrianiſm*; which is clear from *Ruf. Hiſt. Eccl.* Lib, 1 Cap. 21.

The Argument wherewith they endeavour to prove, that the Son was not Conſubſtantial with the Father, was, *that the word* ὁμουσιος *is not found in Scripture,* which appears from this laſt cited Author. They uſed alſo this Argument at a Convention at *Carthage* in the time of *Hunnericus*, with ſuch impudent clamours, that they deafned their hearers. *Chriſtianus Matthias* in his *Theat. Hiſt.* pag 744. So the Reader may ſee here, that the *Quakers* have learned both their Doctrine and Proofs thereof, from the *Arrians*: They ought therefore to have the Name, ſeing they have the thing.

I will here ſubjoin the words of a late *Arrian*, in a Pamphlet of his called *Antith: Chriſt et Antichriſti*, which the Reader may find inſerted and refuted in the 7 Tom. of *Zanchius* his *Works*, which Words are his 20 *Antith.* to be found in Zanch. Col. 872. 2. Tim. 1. "Hold faſt the Form of 'ſound Words, which thou haſt learned of me. 'The Apoſtle enjoined this to Timothy, and all 'the Miniſters of the Church, to the end that they 'may flee ſtrange Words and Phraſes in ſpeaking 'concerning God and the Myſteries of Faith, that 'they may be content with theſe, which he him'ſelf uſed in delivering the Doctrine of Religion, 'theſe words, Trinity, Eſſence, three perſons in one eſſence: "altho they be neither uſed by Chriſt 'nor Paul, but invented by the Councils and Fa"thers: yet ſay the Orthodox, they are neceſſarily "to be keeped in the Church; thereſore let them 'confeſs as the matter is, that they are not the diſciples of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, ſeing ſo raſhly they ſtrive againſt their precepts, and the divine ſimilitude, wherewith the Prophets and Apoſtles did holily expreſſe the Myſtery of the knowledge of God, and Chriſt, being laid aſide, they ſtudy new Forms, and in teaching the Church, they have the ſame oftentimes in their Mouth, not without vile Ignominy both to the doctrine, and Church of Chriſt. Behold now reader the identity of the doctrine of Quakers with that of *Arrians*, from whom they have learned it.

But ſome perhaps may object, ſaying, that this identity is only in words, to whom I anſwer, Either the things imported by theſe words and phraſes, and given by Chriſtians Generally as the meaning thereof, and contained in Scripture or not: now if the firſt be true, then to ſtir up ſtrife about theſe words, proves only the raiſers thereof ridiculous. But 2. Suppoſing that the things themſelves, which Chriſtians underſtand by theſe words, or phraſes are holden forth in Scripture, then to deny that we may uſe them, is founded on this Hypotheſis viz. that in Explication of Scriptures or diſputs about the meaning thereof it is impious, and unlawful to uſe any words or phraſes except they be αυτολεξει or in the ſame Letters and ſyllables in Scripture, tho we be never ſo ſure, that as to the ſenſe and meaning thereof, they be found in the Scriptures, but this Hypotheſis, if true, overthroweth all Scripture conſequences, interpretation of Scripture, blaſts the hope of ever getting Hereticks refuted, which none will deny except an *Arrian*, or the like Hereticks, and while theſe deny it they only oppoſe their own practice to their own opinion, ſeeing they themſelves as other diſputants, endeavour to draw Conſequences from Scripture, and paraphraſe upon it to make it ſpeak for themſelves: Now that this abſurd and blaſphemous conſequence ſticks faſt to this their Hypotheſis, appears from no few places of Scripture, and among others *Math.* 22. 31, 32. For if our Saviour had ſtuck to the meer Letters and Syllables of Exod. 3. 6. *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. without deduction of a conſequence from them, and ſo an expoſition of them, he ſhould never from theſe words have evinced againſt the *Sadducees*, the Reſurrection of the dead. But I need not ſtay longer to evince this, for certain it is, and already proved, not only from the Quakers obſtinate denyall of a free and poſitive Confeſſion of their Faith, anent this matter, but alſo from their uſeing of the ſame weapons with which the *Arrians* attempted the ſubverſion of this trulie Catholick Doctrine, as alſo ſufficiently by the expreſs words of *Fox* and theſe of the *Principles of the Priests*; but this *Arrian* Self Contradicting ſhift they are forced to uſe, being conſcious to themſelves as the *Arrians* before them, that their Doctrine cannot be proof againſt the firm and demonſtrative deductions, which the Orthodox bring from Scripture, with which as ſo many Battering-Rams they with eaſe overthrow this Antitrinitarian Impietie, Therefore the other Branch of the *Dilemma* viz. That the ſenſe of theſe words, i. e. That which all Chriſtians underſtand, as the Meaning thereof according to the *Quakers*, is not in

Scripture. And indeed this is the Truth: And ſo the *Quakers* are *Arrians*, the evicting of which is the intent of this preſent diſcourſe. But yet farther that this is Truth, *viz.* That the *Quakers* are *Arrians*, if not worſe, and deny that fundamental Doctrine of the perſons of the Holy Trinity, and that the Son of God, and the Holy Ghoſt alſo are of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, and diſtinct perſons from him, is moſt evident from their perpetual helliſh railings at the Doctrine of the Holy Trinitie, calling it an *Abominable and ſtinking Doctrine*, as theſe that heard them told me, and when they were reproved, their reply was, *thou knoweſt not the Truth.* Again they demonſtrate to the world, that they are the Frye of *Arrius*, while they reject the Common Tranſlation and Expoſition of *Heb.* 1. 3. Admitted by all except the *Arrians* and their Brethren: For if the word *ὑπόστασις* ought not to be rendred *Perſon* or *Subſiſtence*, as all the *Lexicographers*, and in particular *Scapula*, *Paſor*, *Scrivelius* upon the word, and all the Interpreters both ancient (as *Pareus*, *in locum* ſheweth, and modern, *Dutch Divines*, and Engliſh Tranſlation render it) but, *Subſtance* (for certainly thus it muſt be rendred, if the word *Perſon*, or *Subſiſtence* be rejected) then it ſhall irreſiſtibly follow that the Father and the Son are divided in ſubſtance, which was the Doctrine of *Arrius*, both in Matter and Terms; hence it is clearer than day-light, that theſe men are his Diſciples, yea it is to be obſerved that if the word *ὑπόστασις* in this place ought to be rendered *Subſiſtentia* or *Perſona*, then if a man believe the Scriptures, and that words are the true Symbols of things, it is not poſſible that he be in Judgment an *Arrian*: As contrariwiſe if a Man believe, that the word ought to be rendered *Subſtance*, preſuppoſing the Truth of the Scriptures, and that words are the true Idea's of things, he cannot but be an *Arrian*. Hence that for named *Arri in Antithesi 4ta apud Zanchium*, pag 854 of his forecited book, ſayes Heb, 1. *Chriſt is the ſplendor of the Glorie of God, and figure of His Subſtance, Chriſt is the inviſible God Himſelf, ſays the Church of Rome*: For this *Arrian* ſtill calleth all the oppoſers of *Arrianiſm*, members of the Church of *Rome*, as the *Quakers* do now. But it may be here objected, *that ſeveral very Orthodox Writers have in this place, tranſlated the Greek Word* [illegible] *by that of Subſtantia*; to which I anſwer, that all the Orthodox, both Ancient and Modern: while they thus ſpake, did take the word *Subſtantia*, in the ſenſe that both they, and we do the word *Perſona* or *Subſiſtentia*. This our Aſſertion may be moſt evident to any, though but a little acquainted with the ancient and Modern Orthodox (*i.e.* the oppoſers of *Arrians* and *Socinians*) writers. For *Auguſtin* who in ſeveral places, and in particular *lib.* 5. and 7. *De Trinitate* aſcribeth to God three *Subſtances*, or three *Subſiſtences* indifferently, yet notwithſtanding elſwhere, carefully diſtinguiſheth them, and in particular; *de fide ad Petrum Diaconum* Cap. 1. where he ſayeth, for *if, as the ſubſtance of the Father and the Son is one, ſo alſo they were but one perſon, then there ſhould be nothing at all which truly could be called a Trinitie*. Hence we ſee that this word *Subſtantia* did bear a twofold Signification; in the firſt of which it may be well put into the text as Equivalent with, or the Synonymum of the word *Perſona* without the leaſt ſhadow of prejudice to our Doctrine; it were eaſie to ſhew the like out of *Hilarius*, and others of the Antients. I ſhall content my ſelf to ſet down the words of *Photius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* in his *Bibliotheca Col. 299.* Giving his Judgment concerning a book of *Pierius* an ancient Paſtor, ſaying, as *touching the Father, and the Son he believeth piouſly,* except that he *ſayeth that they are two Subſtances, and as many Natures, howbeit not ſo as he adhereth to Arrius; for as may be gathered from what goes before and followeth, he uſeth the word,* Subſtantia, *for, or in the ſame ſignification with the word* ὑπόστασις *or perſona*: See the ſame Author *Col.* 783, *De Libris Ephremi Patriarchæ Theopolitani*, where he confirmeth at large this our aſſertion. Now obſerve, ſerious Reader, of how great a conſequence in the Judgement of thoſe who are in this great point moſt Orthodox, the right or wrong uſe of theſe words, about which we now treat, was eſteemed, and alſo that they took them in the ſame ſenſe, for which we now plead. But I forbear to add more out of the ancients. For *Calvin Inſt. lib* 1. *cap.* 13. *Sect.* 2. affirmeth this our propoſition of all the Ancient Orthodox without exception, and *Socinus* ingenuouſly confeſſeth it. Of the Modern writers, I affirm the ſame, as is clear from *Calvin ibid.* and *Tremellius* in His verſion of the Text out of the *Syriak*, *Pomeetanus* on the place and others. It is clear then that we have both name and thing in Scripture, and indeed this Text doth ſo clearly hold forth this truly Catholick Doctrine, that *George Keith* is forced to diſcover that which he by all means endeavoureth to palliat: For *Truth Defended* p. 76. 79. He ſayeth *that this Text is to be underſtood ſpeaking of Chriſt as Man only.* Now *I* am ſure, if he could make out this, he ſhould do a piece of nonſuch ſervice unto the *Arrians* and *Socinians*, for this is one of the Texts that they with greateſt Care endeavour to pervert, and wreſt, and the Orthodox to vindicate, inferring alwayes from it the Divinity of Chriſt; but this he ſhall never be able to make out, for there is nothing more clear than that the whole Context and Scope of the Apoſtle doth evince, that this place ſpeaketh of Chriſt as God; and again who dare ſay, except the *Arrians* and *Socinians*, with *George Keith*, that Chriſt as Man can be called *the Brightneſs of the Fathers Glory, or the expreſs Image, or Character of the Father*: Man indeed was made according to the Image of God, but certain it is, that no Creature in Scripture is called the Image of the Father, hence when Chriſt *Col:* 1. 15. Is called the Image of the inviſible God; Divines take the the word (GOD) for the perſon of the Father, neither at all can it be otherwiſe underſtood, for Chriſt is there called the *firſt born of every Creature*, and he *by whom all things were Created*, and *conſiſt*; Hence Chriſt muſt be called the Image of the inviſible God according to his God-head, and by a good Conſequence by (God) muſt be underſtood the Perſon of the Father as a diſtinct Subſiſtence from that of the Son. From all which I conclude, that ſo firm is the Truth of our Doctrine, that the very things that ſeem to infringe and weaken it, reſolve only into a fair Occaſion of, and making way for its clearer Evidence and ſtronger Corroboration.

Add to all this, that the primitive Church carefully retained theſe Words, and Phraſes, as either being in Scripture, *in Terminis*, or bottomed thereon, and as being the true Symbols of theſe Divine Things, whereby the Church might moſt fitly expreſs her mind, and repel the *Sophiſtry* of Hereticks, both before, but eſpecially after the riſe of the *Arrian Hereſie*: Hence *Juſtin Martyr* hath a book inticuled εκθεσεις περι της ορθης ομολογιας ητοι περι της αγιας ομουσιου τριαδος, and deſcribes a Perſon of the Holy Trinity υποστασις εστι της αγιας τριαδος εις.τροπος, &c. And *Damaſc. de Orth. fide*, and others follow him in this Deſcription. Theſe and the like Phraſes are generally found in the works of the Fathers, as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others before the riſe of *Arrianiſm*, but eſpecially after it, as *Auguſtin*, *Athanaſius*, *Hilarius*, *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*, *Euſebius*, *Rufinus*, *Sozomenes*, and many others, divers of which, as *Auguſtin*, & *Athanaſius*, hath books with Titles expreſly concerning the Holy Trinity: But as I ſaid before, after the riſe of the *Arrian* and *Sabellian* Hereſies, the Church with greater Care and Acuracy, diſtinguiſhed the words, Subſtance, and Subſiſtence, as he that pleaſes may ſee in *Ruf. l. i.* Cap. 29 and in the Hiſtory of *Sozomenes*, writing of the Council of *Alexandria*. Notable alſo to this purpoſe, and never to be forgotten are the words of *Athanaſius*, who in his Symbol thus ſpeaketh, *Whoſoever will be ſaved, before all things, it is neceſſary, that he hold the Catholick Faith, which Faith, except every man keep wholly, and inviolat, without doubt he ſhall eternally periſh; this truly is the right Catholick Faith, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, without confounding the Perſons, neither ſeparating the Subſtance,* &c. From which Time, to this day, the Church hath Religiouſly Obſerved theſe Words, and Phraſes, whereby She might expreſs the Truth, and diſtinguiſh her ſelf from that *Porphyrian* ſect of the *Arrians*, (as *Conſtantin* the great called them) and other Hereticks. By this Time, I am confident that he that will not cloſe his Eyes, may perceive that the Doctrine of *Quakers*, is all one with that of *Arrians*, *Macedonians*, *Sabellians*, which is the purpoſe of this Diſcourſe. But yet *ex abundanti*, I will tranſcribe a Paſſage or two further, The firſt of which is in *Truth Def*. This compleat *Arrian*, and ſelf contradicter, having ſaid pag 75. That, *It is only the unſcriptural Terms of Trinity, and Perſons, which he denyeth, and not the Myſtery*, pag 77. He giveth himſelf the lie, and palpably bewrayeth his *Arrianiſm*, in theſe words. *And if Jo: Alexander his definition of a Perſon be received, that it is an Intelligent Beeing, ſubſiſting incommunicably or diſtinctly one from another, I do not ſee, for my part but that three Perſons, at this rate, ſhall infer three Intelligent Beeings, ſubſiſting incommunicably,* *and conſequently three Gods.* Behold, Reader, the the *Arrian* daſhing againſt the ſame ſtumbling-ſtone, upon which *Arrians, and* Socinians have alwayes broken their necks. For upon this very Account, that it ſeemed to them to infer three Gods, the *Arrians* and *Sabellians* of old, and the *Socinians* at this day always malign, and endeavour what they can, to render odious that moſt neceſſary Doctrine of the H*oly Trinity*. With this paſſage of *George Keith*, well agreeth what *Hubberthorn* in his Reply to *Sherlock* impiouſly belloweth forth pag 19. *That there is no Scripture for the Catholick Faith, and Trinity, and three Perſons.*

Before I paſſe this Matter, I cannot but take Notice of the ſtrange dealing of Ge*orge Keith*, attempting to make *Auguſtin* a Patroniſer of his *Arrian* Doctrine; For in *Truths* Def: Cap 5. The Qu*aker* hath theſe Words. *And indeed Auguſtin in his* 5 *and* 7 *Books of the Trinity, not only ſayeth, the Words (three Perſons) are improper, but diſputeth againſt them, as I ſuppoſe. Io. Alexander for all his School Logick, and Philoſophy ſhall hardly be able to anſwer his Argument, the ſubſtance of Which, to my beſt remembrance, is this, The word Perſon, either it ſignifieth ſomewhat abſolute and ſimple, or relative; to ſay the firſt is abſurd, otherways there ſhall be three abſolute Beeings, or Eſſence's in God, which is abſurd; If ſomewhat* R*elative, which is referred or relative to another, as Father is relative to a Son (and therefore a Father is Father of another, and no man is his own Father) then to ſay, the Father is a perſon, is to ſay, the Father* *is the Perſon of ſome other, and ſo of the reſt, which is abſurd, to the which Argument, not as mine, but really* Auguſtin's, *I leave* Joh. Alexander *to anſwer.* Thus *George Keith. Anſ.* It ſeemeth that the Intent of the *Quaker* is, to faſten a falſe Contradiction on *Auguſtin*; for none ever uſed the word *Perſon*, in Application to the Holy Trinity, more frequently than *Auguſtin* hath done, as is obvious to any, that hath but a little acquaintance with his Works. And *de Trinit. Lib.* 5. *Cap* 8. He aſſerteth 'that the Latine Fathers, yea, and theſe of 'greateſt Authority among them, ſtill uſed the 'word *Perſon*, as the moſt fit that could be imagined, 'for the expreſſing of this Holy Myſtery. To whom he aſſenteth both in this place, and elſe where, in the ſame Books, Cited by *George Keith*. We may hence ſee, what the drift of the *Quaker* is, even to render both the Perſons and Doctrine of the choiceſt Champions of Chriſt, odious and contemptable, by making them ſpeak ſelf-contradictions, and that in theſe very points, anent which, if the Body of the Chriſtian World be not groſly deceived, they were of all men, moſt Orthodox. 2. This ſame Father, *de Doctrina Chriſti.* Lib 1. Cap 5. Alledgeth, that the word *Cauſa*, cannot ſufficiently enough agree to God. And Cap 6. That the word *Deus*, is not fit enough, whereby God can be expreſſed. Sure *I* am, that in both theſe Books, mentioned by the *Quaker*, he ſaith nothing whereby we may conclude, that he is more diſliking the word *Perſon*, than the word *Cauſa*, or *Deus*. But ſhall I think, that *George Keith* judgeth, that according to the mind of *Auguſtin*, God is not the Creator, or firſt cauſe of all things? And that we ſin in expreſſing him by the Name of God? *I* do not think that the *Quaker* will aſſent to this, and yet no more Reaſon hath he to ſay, that according to *Auguſtin*, it is dangerous to ſay, that there are three Perſons in the Trinity. For the main Reaſon why he thinketh that there is ſome inconſiſtency in the word (Perſon) for the full expreſſing of that inexpreſſible Myſtery, he giveth *de Trinit.* Lib 7. Cap 4 In theſe words, " When they enquire of us, what " Three? or how theſe Three ſhall be called? we " ſet our ſelves to find ſome ſpecial or general " Name, neither can we find it, becauſe the ſupereminency of the Deity exceeds the ſtrength of our " Eloquence, and God is more truely Comprehended " by the Mind, than expreſſed by the Tongue, and " more truly exiſteth, than comprehended in the " Mind. This I ſay, is the Reaſon, why *Auguſtin* thinketh the word (Perſon) not ſufficient enough, for the Declaration of this incomprehenſible Myſtery: But the ſame is the Reaſon why, *de Doctrina Chriſt. Lib* 1. *Cap* 5. He thinketh that the word *Cauſe* cannot agree to God: Hence it is apparent, That an Atheiſt might as well, and with as good ground alledge, that *Auguſtin* in the forecited places did patronize his Atheiſm, and publiſh to the world that God is not the Supream cauſe of all things, or that there is not a God. 3. I have with care peruſed theſe Books of *Auguſtin*, but could not at all find this Argument which *George Keith* fathereth upon him: I Anſwer therefore the Argument not as *Auguſtin's*, but as a ſinnowleſs Argument of *George Keith*, drawn from a ſimily of natural things, which hath little or no proportion to that which is Infinit. Hence I ſay, that it can have little or no weight. But again the Argument is falſe, and Ridiculous, on this Account, that the *Quakers* make every Father, the Perſon of his Son, which I am ſure is abſurd enough. For as a Father is the Father of another, and yet a diſtinct Perſon from another, ſo God the Father, is the Father of God the Son, and yet a diſtinct Perſon from God the Son. Hence the ſimilie brought, not by *Auguſtin*, but by the *Quaker*, for the overthrow of the Truth, tendeth to the Illuſtration, and clearing thereof. From all this Learn how diſingenuous Dealers theſe men are, that can find no better Means for the defence, and propagation of their Doctrine, than to deceive the Simple, by borrowing the Names of the Antient Worthies, whereby to cover their blaſphemous Doctrine. Thus their beſt refuge is to broach Lies, in Hypocriſies.

2. I ſhall prove that according to the *Quakers* Doctrine, *God is the Author of ſin*, which I thus Evince.

God is the Author of every Subſtance, but according to the *Quakers* Doctrine, Sin is a Subſtance. The Minor I prove, Grace is a Subſtance, which is their Common Doctrine, therefore ſin is a Subſtance alſo. The conſequence *Rob*: Bar*clay Vind: pag* 49. denyeth, which I thus prove, the Antecedent *viz.* that Grace is a Subſtance, they endeavour to prove by theſe Reaſons, Firſt "becauſe it is in and by

"this inward, and ſubſtantial Seed in their hearts,
"as it cometh to receive nouriſhment, and to have a
"Birth, and Geniture in them, they come to have
"theſe Spiritual Senſes raiſed, by which they are
"made capable of Taſting, Smelling, Seeing, and
"Handling the things of God. Thus reaſoned **Robert** *Barclay* in his *Apology* pag 95. This is alſo the Doctrine of *George Keith* in his *Immed.* Rev. *That this* Light, *or Seed, or Grace, is a Subſtance, becauſe it may feel, hear &c.*

Robert Barclays ſecond Reaſon is, *becauſe it ſubſiſts in the hearts of wicked men, even while they are in their wickedneſs.* Now if Sin may hear, feel, and perceive, as well as Grace and Light, and if it may feel, or perceive the things of Satan, as really as Grace feels, or perceiveth the things of God, and if ſin may be in the heart of a real godly perſon, then ſin is a Subſtance, according to the Quakers; Otherwiſe theſe Reaſons are reaſonleſſe: But the former is true, therefore the latter. The Conſequence of the Major is moſt firm. For ſin in the heart of one that is truly godly, is the ſame way to be conſidered, as Grace, and *L*ight in the heart of the ungodly in this point. For I judge this be the Reaſon, why the Quakers Judge that this is the Reaſon, that the Beeing of Grace in the Heart of a wicked Man, while in his wickedneſs proveth it to be a ſubſtance viz. Becauſe it can be where its contrary is, and ſtrive, and wreſtle with it, which is as evident concerning ſin in the heart of a godly man, as is clear from Rom. 7. Gal. 5, 17, and alſo from Experience

rience, which I believe our Adverſaries themſelves would hardly deny, ſeing they grant that all Perſons, that have real Grace are not at all times, after Converſion free of ſin, and wreſtling with it. Hence the Charge that they moſt maliciouſly lay to the Reformed Churches *viz.* that *they make God the Author of Sin*, is juſtly returned upon themſelves, ſeing God is the Author of every Subſtance. Which is yet more clear from the twelfth *Query*, ſent *to Mr John Alexander* viz. *What is Original Sin? Whether it be not the Devil?* yea *or nay? For doth not the Original ſignifie the Beginning? What did Chriſt come to deſtroy? Was it not the Devil and his Works?* What is more clear, than that in thoſe *Queries* of the Quakers, God is made the Author of Sin? ſeing that unleſſe they profeſſe, and avow *Manicheiſm*, God created the Devil, and this is yet more clear, if clearer can be, by *George Keiths* Defence of this Querie *Truth defend:* pag. 177. Where he can find no better Defence of this blaſphemy, than to call it in effect a *purpoſeleſs heap of words without all ſcope*, ſaying, that 'the Devil may be called 'ſin, in a certain ſenſe by a Metonymy, as Chriſt 'is called Righteouſneſs, or ſin, called the old Man. And thus *George Keith* acteth like himſelf, that is playeth the ridiculous babler, for pag. 59. in Defence of that Query viz. "If every Title in the 'Bible be the word of God' he ſayeth, "that to 'query a thing, will not conclude, that the queſtioniſt doth poſitively affirm, or deny what is 'queried. The ſame way he dealeth here with his

Antagoniſt. For if the *Quakers* underſtood no other thing, then the Devil may get the Name of ſin, as any cauſe may get the name of its effect: Then both they, and he in their Defence, prove themſelves to be pitiful, purpoſeleſs wranglers, making a ſtur in the World about nothing: And of ſet purpoſe involving their Diſcourſes in ſuch non'enſical Niceties, that none ſhal know the meaning thereof: Hence we may ſee, that it is but vain Labour to give any *A*nſwer to the Quakers. For whatever they have ſaid, you cannot fix upon them, be as clear as it will; they will in their next Eſſay explain it to you in a ſenſe, as oppoſite to that, which in the Judgment of all rational men, their words carry; as Black is oppoſite to White, or Light to Darkneſs. For what is more clear from the Words of the Query than that the Devil is ſin it ſelf? ſeing I think no Man, except *George Keith*, will deſire us to believe that all theſe Queſtions are given out for needleſs amuſements of the World, importing only theſe things; about which there is not the leaſt ſhadow of a queſtion, or doubt, for who ever doubted that the Devil was the cauſe of Sin? Neither is his abuſe of Scripture more tolerable: ſeing the Apoſtle uſeth a figurative Speech, which in a matter known, and about which there is no debate; as the Matter was, about which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, may contribute much to the illuſtration, and clearing of the purpoſe: but far otherwiſe was it, whereſoever Chriſt, or the Apoſtles entred into any direct Diſputation, or reaſoning, where they always ſo ſpake, as theſe with whom they Reaſoned might have eaſily underſtood what theſe Queſtions, and Reaſonings tended to. In a word he that of ſet purpoſe involveth, and rendereth unintelligible his Diſcourſe about Matters of ſuch moment, in the Judgment of all Rationals proveth himſelf either a Fool, or a Knave: Therefore whether *George Keith* will, or not, we muſt do theſe Queſtioniſts right, and believe that they thought as they ſpake, that is, *that the Devil is ſin it ſelf.* And therefore God is the Author of ſin.

3. I come now to the third thing, of which I promiſed to prove the Quakers guilty, *viz. That the Soul is God,* or as they with the like blaſphemy ſpeak *a part of God.* And firſt to clear the way for the Souls Divinity, they deny its Humanity; For *Hubberthorn* in his reply to Mr. *Sherlok* pag. 29. ſayeth, “there is no Scripture which ſpeaketh of a Humane Soul. And again pag. 31. to Mr. *Sherlok* ſaying that “God is not a Spirit, as Angels, and the Souls of men are; he replyeth, ſaying “this is confuſion: For Chriſt ſayeth, God is a Spirit, and they that worſhip him; muſt worſhip him in Spirit, and Truth. And there thou art raced without the Doctrine of Chriſt. And pag. 30. in oppoſition to Mr. *Sherlock*, who had accuſed the *Quakers* of profeſſing, and blaſphemouſly boaſting of their Equality with God, he thus replyeth, “Thy boaſting is excluded without, in thy Generation. And thou art excluded from the life, and mind of the Apoſtle, who ſaid, Let the ſame Mind be in you that was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus, who being in the *Form*

‘ *of God*, thought it no Robbery to be equal with
‘ God. Phil. 2, 5, 6. And this thou calleth blaſphemy,
‘ and ſo thou haſt ſhewed what *S*pirit thou
‘ art of ; contrary to the Apoſtle, here we have
Blaſphemy in its higheſt Degree, and an Equality
with God profeſſed, and boaſted of ; For the Effectation
of which being prompted thereunto by the
grand Enemy of Mankind, Our firſt Parents fell
from their Excellency, and moſt happy Condition:
And except Chriſt had interpoſed, had forever
lien together, with all their Poſterity into
that whirle pool, and gulf of Incomprehenſible
Miſery, only for the deſire of aſpiring unto this, of
which theſe Heaven darring blaſphemers boaſt
themſelves: ſo that what the *Poets* feigned of the
Gyants contending with the gods, for an Equal
Right to Heaven with them, the Quakers act in
Reality. But the following diſcourſe will evince,
that an Equality with God will not pleaſe them,
except they have alſo an Identity: For *George Fox* the
great Prophet, and King of the Quakers in his *great
Myſt.* pag. 90. In anſwer to one, that ſaid
“ there is a kind of infinitneſs in the Soul, yet it
‘ cannot be infinitneſs in it ſelf, ſpeaketh thus,
‘ Is not the *S*oul without beginning? coming from
‘ God, returning to God again? who hath it in
‘ his hand, and Chriſt the Power of God, the Biſhop
‘ of the Soul, which bringeth it up to God,
‘ which came out from him? hath this a beginning,
‘ or ending? and is not this infinite in it
‘ ſelf? again *George Fox* telleth us in the forecited
book pag. 29. that *Magnus Byne* ſayeth ‘ that
the

‘ the Soul is not infinite in it ſelf, but a Creature,
and R. *Baxter* ſayeth it ‘is a Spiritual Subſtance,
whereunto *George Fox* Replyeth, “ Conſider
‘ what a Condition theſe called Miniſters are in ;
‘ they ſay that which is a ſpiritual Subſtance, is
‘ not infinit in it ſelf, but a Creature : that which
‘ came out of the Creator, and is in the Hand of
‘ the Creator, which bringeth it up unto the Cre-
‘ ator again, that is infinite in it ſelf. Again
Great Myſt. p. 100. The Quakers are accuſed for
ſaying, there is no Scripture that ſpeaketh of a
Humane Soul : And for affirming that the Soul is
taken up unto God ; Hereunto *George Fox* thus an-
ſwereth, “ God breathed into Man the Breath of
‘ Life, and he became a Living Soul. And is not
‘this that which cometh out from God? is in Gods
‘hand ? part of God? from God ? and to God a-
‘gain? from theſe paſſages it is moſt evident, that
both the Soul of man ; yea and the Devils them-
ſelves (which I tremble to think) muſt be God
over all; Seing according to theſe monſters of men,
that which is a ſpiritual Subſtance, is infinit of it
ſelf, and not a Creature,and therefore God himſelf :
For none will deny that both the Souls of men, and
the Devils themſelves are ſpiritual ſubſtances.
Hence it will follow, that God, or a part of God
(as they moſt blaſphemously ſpeak) committeth
ſin, which confirmeth that which we ſaid before
viz. that according to the *Quakers* Doctrine, God
is the Author of ſin. From this Monſtruous Doctrine
it alſo followeth that God, or a part of God is con-
demned, and is, and ſhall be tormented in Hell for
ever. It followeth alſo from this Doctrine, that

God is divided in parts, and that one part of him is *Biſhop*, and Ruler over another. Theſe and a thouſand other ſuch helliſh Blaſphemies follow upon this Doctrine, in which it is needleſs to inſiſt. For as *Calvin* ſaid, *Fatuitas dogmatis me ſecurum reddit*. The very Poiſon it ſelf being ſo black, and helliſh, at its very firſt appearance carrieth along with it a ſufficient *A*ntidot. For we may well Cry out with *Photius* Col 403. of the wicked *Manichean*, and Heathniſh hater of Chriſt, *Agapius*, who was the *Quakers* Anceſtor in this *B*laſphemy, O hudge madneſs! and indeed (if ſuch a ſad matter did permit any Jeſting)One might readily phanſie, that the *D*evil were now doting through old Age, for certainly he ſeemeth to be deprived of his ordinarie Slight and Subtility, that could find no gilding, or Varniſhing, whereby to cover the Superlative Impiety of this *D*octrine : but what he wanteth in *D*eceit, he hath requited in Strength, who could thus Captivat, and Impoſe upon the Judgement of Rational Animals, ſo that they drunk down this Potion ſo manifeſtly peſtiferous. Several of theſe paſſages were cited by *Mr. Broun*. The palpable abominableneſs of which, wholly rendred them incapable of any *D*efence, or ſhew of any honeſt meaning : And the manifeſt Evidence thereof from the *Quakers* own Books, made them altogether undeniable: Therefore *Robert Barclay* (as he dealeth with all the reſt) paſſeth them over with *S*ilence. And yet, as if a Sport could have diverted any ſerious Man ; from the abhorrency of *Quakeriſm*, in the laſt Section of his *Vindication*, he maketh himſelf ridiculous, ſaying, that *Mr. Hicks*, who cited ſome of theſe paſſages; Succumbed in a Diſput againſt the *Quakers*, and from this, giveth out that *Hicks*, and ſuch others, are not to be believed, ſay what they will of the *Quakers*, notwithſtanding that *Robert Barclay* adventureth not to challenge either *Mr.* B. or *Hicks* of any particular miſcarriage, in their particular Citations of the *Quakers* Books. This was therefore a ſtrange Influence and more admirable, than that of the Remora upon a Ship, that *Hicks* his ſuppoſed failing had on this multitude of blaſphemous paſſages, that it looſed R: *Bar*: and his Brethren, from any Obligation to anſwer for them, though they be to be found exactly as they are cited. He here mentioneth ſeveral Books written by *Quakers*, as anſwers to what *Hicks and Faldo* hath ſaid, and among thers, *Pen's Invalidity of Faldo's Vindication.* In which book *Pen* ſometimes proclaimeth himſelf a *Sadducee*, as in the point of Reſurrection: ſometimes a *Papiſt*, as in the point of Juſtification. At other times, more Antichriſtian than moſt of *Pagans*; Endeavouring with might and main, not only to robb the Holy Scriptures of their Divinity, but alſo of common Senſe: Of which Doctrine the Reader hath gotten a taſte above. And O that it might be the lot of all the obſtinate Oppoſers of the Truths of God, thus to bewray at once, both Weakneſs, and wickedneſs, even when they think to appear like ſo many Goliahs for ſtrength, and to Juſtifie their Adverſaries Charge, even while they attempt the removal thereof! as *William Pen* hath done.

This horrible Impiety, theſe men following the *Manicheans*, (whom *Auguſtin de Civi Dei.* Lib. 7 Cap 2, 8. *de Geneſi ad Lit.* refuteth both in principles, and Probation) father upon the Holy Scriptures, *viz.* Gen 2,7. where it is ſaid, *That God breathed into mans noſtrils, the Breath of Life, or Lives.* On this place alſo Ro: *Bar.* Vind Sect 5, par. 1, foundeth, (or at leaſt ſeemeth to found) his opinion of a *S*ubſtantial Light, and Seed diſtinct from the Soul, that remained with *Adam* after his fall. But theſe Opinions though contrary to one another, are both contrary to the Truth: For there is nothing either in the Words, and Phraſes, or Scope, and Context that favoureth either of them וַיִּפַּח doth not in the leaſt favour either of them, which according to the conſent of the beſt Hebreans, is to be taken Metaphorically, and efficiently, not properly, *ſive inſtar Cauſæ materialis*, materially. Neither doth the word נִשְׁמַת help them any more, which according to the mind of all ſound Interpreters, as Pareus on the place ſheweth, and *Lexicographers*, as *Buxtorf*, Lewſden, Bithner, Leigh, ſignifieth only, *the rational Soul of man.* Hence the Opinion of *Rob: Bar.* is overthrown. Moreover, this word is uſed *Iſa.* 2. 22. where the holy Ghoſt ſayeth, that Mans breath is in his noſtrils; to the end that he may demonſtrate the frailty of man. Hence we may conclude, that nothing of God, or of his Divine Nature can by the force, or ſignificancy of this word be neceſſarily imported, חַיִּים which ſometimes ſignifieth Beaſts, as well as Men; All the forecited Authors underſtand by it, the Soul of man: And tell us that theſe who are no more critical conſidering it is in the plural number, take *Senſitive*, as well as *Rational*, here to be meaned. Others judge this Criticiſm to be neglected, becauſe that oftentimes in the Hebrew a word is *Voce pluralis, & ſignificatu ſingularis Vide* Leigh *Critica Sacra* pag 72. The word נֶפֶשׁ yet further confirmeth, that no other thing is to be underſtood in this place, but the ſoul of man. For the Duſt of the Earth formed by God into the Body of man, and this breath of Life, became a נֶפֶשׁ or a living Soul, as alſo that the Soul of man is nothing Divine properly ſo called; Seing this word ſometimes ſignifieth the *body of man*. As *Pſal.* 16. 10. and elſewhere ſignifieth any living creature. Moreover, the ſcope of the place, which is to repeat more fully the Creation of man, which in the former Chapter was more ſhortly hinted at, evinceth that there is nothing here to be underſtood, but the creation of the Soul, and Body of man. But we need not inſiſt to prove our negative from this place, ſeing this is the only place, on which our Adverſaries build their Affirmatives. It is enough for us, to challenge them to bring forth the leaſt appearance of reaſon for them, which as they have not done hitherto, ſo ſhall never be able to do. Again as they to the horrour of all men elevat the Creature, not only to an equality, but an Identity with the Creator, and ſo make that which is leſſe than nothing all in all, and God over all bleſſed for ever, ſo with equal Impiety they bring down the glorious God, levelling him with the duſt, and ſubject that moſt pure and Impaſſible beeing, to the weakeſt frailties of Mankind, Alledging that Chriſt weeped as God, and not as man over *Jeruſalem*, but that they may want all ground of Complaint; Let us hear themſelves, who in the *principles of the Prieſts of Scotland* pag 33. ſay It *was asked of him* viz. *Henry Foreſide,, of a foreordained number to deſtruction, and for what Chriſt wept over Jeruſalem.* He anſwered, *as he was Human, he mourned and his god-head decreed them to hell, this is a lying Doctrine of the devil, for after, many of them of Jeruſalem came to be converted, as ye may read in* Acts 2. *And many of the* Prieſts *came to be obedient to the Faith, for all being gone aſtray both Jews, and Gentiles,* Rom 2 9. *concluded under ſin, the pure, the* Eternal *tendered over them; who had ſtopped their ears, and cloſed their eyes to that which was pure of God in them, that they might have come to that which is pure, and have been gathered under Chriſts wings,* Mat. 23, 37. *Who is pure, and ſo have been converted, and healed, and have heard with their ears, and ſeen with their* Eyes. *And as for the word (Humane) that is not Scripture* Language, *it ſpeaketh not that Language.*

CHAP. V.

Of Chriſt, and of his Benefits.

THE *Quakers* in words, commonly acknowledge that Chriſt is God and Man, and account it a wrong, when they are accuſed of the denyal thereof: But beſide theſe two Natures they really maintain a third, *viz.* a Spiritual and Heavenly nature in Chriſt, which they call the Heavenly man, Chriſt Jeſus, which heavenly man, they ſay, did exiſt before the incarnation of Chriſt Jeſus, and aſſert, *that on the Fleſh and Blood of this man, the Church in all Ages did feed.* For *George Keith* in his *way caſt up, pag 38, 93, 96.* " Sayeth, Chriſt as Man, " was and is before all, the firſt and the laſt, Id: *pag* " *90.* The Man Chriſt influenceth all *Men* by his " life, and is in them; *and pag 93.* 'The word " made fleſh created all things, and the word only is is not properly the Chriſt. And *George Keith* in that Book contendeth at large, ' that ' Chriſt before his Incarnation was as properly the ' Chriſt as he is now. And in the ſame book pag. 94 he ſayeth " Chriſt as man came down from Heaven " *Idem ibid.* Chriſts Fleſh and Blood came down " from Heaven. *pag 94, 95.* ' Thus Chriſt hath " Spiritual Fleſh and Blood, *pag 95.* Of his Spi-

"ritual fleſh and blood did the Saints of old eat &
"drink. *pag* 97. 98. He ſaith, The Man Chriſt is to be
"underſtood *prov.* 8. 23, I was ſet up from everlaſting
" from the beginning, or ever the earth was. And
" *Pſ.* 110. 1, 2, 3. and pag 99, 100, 108. It was this life
" of Chriſt as Man, that was preſſed as a Cart *&c.*
" *Amos* 2. 13. *pag* 100, 108, 109. Thus (ſaith he) Apoſtats
" crucifie to themſelves again the Son of God.
" *Heb.* 6, 6. *pag* 100. Thus hath Chriſt been crucified
" by the wicked from the beginning. *Ibid.* Chriſt
" the Heavenly man lived in *Abraham* and *Moſes.*
" *pag* 102. Chriſt was true, and real Man before
" he was born of *Mary*, *pag* 103. The word
' was made fleſh from the beginning and dwelt in us,
" *pag* 104. According to his Heavenly Nature,
" even as Man, He (Chriſt) was the ſon of God, *pag.*
' 123. The Man Chriſt is every where, That is, his Soul
" is extended into all, in his divine ſeed and body,
" which is his Heavenly Fleſh and Blood. From all which, beſide other moſt horrid abſurdities and blaſphemies which follow upon this their Doctrine, this is a clear conſequent, That Chriſt hath three Natures. To this they anſwer *Quak.* Confir: *p.* 33 *That it will no more follow from their Doctrine, that Chriſt hath three natures, than it will follow from ours, who aſſert that Chriſt aſſumed into Union with the Divine nature, a Body, and a Soul.* But this anſwer is eaſily repelled, for a Body & a Soul conſidered both together make up but one humane nature: Whereas according to their Doctrine, he was Man before his incarnation, and again

again man by incarnation, ſeing every incarnation bringeth a man to the World: Which incarnation they have not yet denyed (at leaſt in words) And therefore Chriſt hath two entire humane Natures, and yet theſe ſtrictly conjoyned together in One man. Which doctrine maketh our bleſſed Lord a down-right Monſter.

2. The *Quakers* doctrine, as it rendereth the Humanitie of Chriſt altogether Monſtruous, ſo it quite annihilateth, and deſtroyeth his Divinity. For *Chriſtopher Atkinſon* a known Quaker in a book of his entituled *The Sword of the Lord* in opoſition to the ſixth of the propoſitions (which *Philip Nye*, *Thomas Godwine*, *and Sidrah Simſon* drew up at the appointment of *Cromwel*, whereby he might regulate himſelf in the tolleration of Sectaries) *viz. Chriſt is God*, ſaid, " Hear Sotiſh minds " your imagined God beyond the Stars, and your " carnal Chriſt which ye would make appear ' through your Heathniſh Philoſophy, is utterly de" nyed, and teſtified againſt by the light. *In theſe* words the God-head of Chriſt is ſo evidently denyed, yea, and his manhood too, that the Quakers are able to put no Commentarie, or gloſſe upon them (which is their uſual cuſtom, whereby to varniſh, and make any thing ſpeak what they will) And therefore to the *Students* of *Aberdeen* who Quak. Canvaſs. *pag.* 82. Have objected this paſſage unto them, they anſwer Quak. Conf. *pag* 36 *that they cannot light upon Atkinſons book.* But it is not to be believed that ſuch active, and buſſie Spirits for the promotion of Quakeriſme,

as *Robert Barclay* and *George Keith* are, men of ſo great acquaintance; and correſpondence with the *Quakers* in *England* could not obtain the ſight of a book, which certainly is frequent enough there. But it mattereth not much what they ſay, for they ſtick not to deny paſſages that are *verbatim* in their own books. Of which kind of dealing take one place of many which might eaſily be given *Will: Pen, Sand: Found:* pag 26 ſayeth, *that Chriſt fulfilled the Law only as our pattern or example.* And yet Reſ: againſt Rail. *pag* 78 counteth his adverſary *Hicks* a forger for repeating theſe words, and ſtifly denyeth that there is ſuch a paſſage there, ſaying, *I am very certain that the word (only) was not there.* See *Hicks Dial.* 3. *pag* 74, 75, 76. Where you ſhall find a large bundle of the like impudent, and inexcuſable lies. They ſay alſo, they can prove, that *Chriſtopher Aitkinſon* was not a *Quaker*, which they may eaſily ſay; but they ought to have proved it, not ſaid it only, otherwiſe theſe words ſerve only to teſtifie their diſſatisfaction, with the ingenuous plainneſs of *Aitkinſon*, in which he unmasketh, and layeth open to the World, what the reſt of the *Quakers* involve in Clouds of ſtrange and myſterious Language, equivocal, and hardly intelligible terms; being the only covert, that they can find under which to ſhroud their abominable Doctrine. Laſtly, ſay they, *If he deny Chriſt to be Man, we diſown him, who do ſay that Chriſt is Both God, and Man.* This is a good confeſſion. And a man that knew them not, might eaſily think that we wronged them, by charging them with the denyal of the Divinity of Chriſt. But notwithſtanding hereof, this confeſſion ſerveth only to prove theſe Men guilty, of moſt wicked hypocriſie, lying, and ſelf Contradiction to put a cheat upon the World, and cover their abominations: For whoſoever taketh but an overly veiw of the paſſages above cited of *George Keiths way caſt up*, he may clearly ſee, that if theſe paſſages be true Doctrine, the greateſt arguments, for eſtabliſhing the Divinity of Chriſt are for ever gone. For *I* appeal to the writings of all who have refuted the Doctrine of *Arrius and Socinus*, if *prov.* 8. 23. Be not brought as one of the main texts to prove the Eternity, and Divinity of Chriſt; as alſo *Pſal.* 110 by which Chriſt himſelf ſilenced, and for ever ſtopped the mouths of the *Phariſees*, who denyed his God-head, *Matth.* 22, 43, 44, 45, 46. Neither is there a greater argument, than *that by him all things were Created*: And yet if theſe forecited paſſages be true, the denyers of Chriſts Divinity have an eaſie anſwer, that all theſe things are verified of Chriſt as man only; And ſo the greateſt arguments for the Divinitie of Chriſt fall to the Ground. Now let any man judge if the *Quakers* do not what in them lye to overthrow the Divinity of Chriſt, ſeeing they endeavour to undermine, and deſtroy all the arguments by which it is underpropped. Moreover this Doctrine robbeth God of his incommunicable attributs, in aſcribing Omnipreſence, or Ubiquitie to a Man. But before I leave this point, *I* propoſe this dilemma to the *Quakers*.

If all things were created by Chriſt as Man, then either the Manhood of Chriſt is created or not; if created, then it is created by it ſelf, than which there is nothing more abſurd; If uncreated, then there is an uncreated man, and a man that is coeternal with God. Which Blaſphemie its hardly able to equalize, far leſſe to outdo. From all which it is moſt evident, that the *Quakers* doe what in them lyeth, to evert the fundamental Doctrines and baſis of the Chriſtian Religion *viz.* the *Godhead of Chriſt.* And in this they are more wicked, than the profeſſed *Arrians*, or *Socinians*, that they add deep diſſimulation, and hypocriſie to their horrid impiety, whereas the *Arrians* and *Socinians* more ingenuous than they, profeſs in words what they really believe. It is alſo clear that in ſtead of their Chriſt, they embrace a meer chimerical non-entity: ſeing there is nothing more contradictiorie, than that either the Soul or the Body of a man, which is a meer creature, can be every where, or from Eternitie. Laſtly obſerve that the *Quakers* put no diſtinction betwixt their Chriſt, and their light within, and that the light within is nothing but the ſmal dark Relicts of the Image of God, or the dimm light of nature, as we have already evinced. And ſo their Chriſt, their God, and all that is dear unto them, reſolve at length into this almoſt quenched ſpunk, in which, all who have truſted, in ſtead of finding the ſafe port of Eternal happineſs, have alwayes met with certain Shipwrack.

In favours of this *Spiritual* AntiChriſt, or *Antichriſtian* figment, which they account for their Chriſt, they decry, vilifie, and do what they can to overthrow whatever ought to be precious and dear to a Chriſtian (for what will they not deny, ſeing they deny the Godhead of Chriſt) they therefore with open mouth blaſpheme, and deny Jeſus Chriſt as a perſon without them, or as any thing diſtinct from their *Imaginary* Chriſt, or light within, of many which we could cite, take a few paſſages for proof hereof; & firſt *Geo: Whith*: Dip. *Pl. pag* 13.
‘Jeſus Chriſt a perſon without us, is not *S*cripture
‘Language, but the Anthropomorphits, and
‘Mugletonians. And in his Appen: to Reaſ: againſt
‘Rail: *pag* 21. The Socinian telleth us of a perſonal
‘ Chriſt, and that the man Chriſt Jeſus our Lord
‘ hath in Heaven a place remote from Earth, a humane
‘ body, but doth he believe him to be the
‘eternal God, while he imagineth him to be a perſonal
‘ Chriſt, a humane Body ſo Limited, and
‘confined to a remotneſs? And *William* Pen
‘counterfit chriſtian *pag* 77, 78. Give me one place,
‘that mentioneth Chriſt to be a diſtinct perſon without
‘ us, art thou deſtitute of common Senſe, as to
‘think of proving the *Quaker* no chriſtian, becauſe
‘ he denyeth, that Doctrine not expreſſed in
‘the Scripture? *George Fox* Great Myſt: 206 If
‘there be any other Chriſt, but he that was crucified
‘ within, he is the falſe Chriſt, and he
‘that hath not this Chriſt that was riſen,
‘and crucified within, is a reprobate. Though
‘*Devils* and reprobats may make a talk of him
‘without. And Great Myſt: *pag* 207 God's Chriſt

'is not diſtinct from his Saints; nor his Body, for 'he is within them, not diſtinct from their Spirits. '*Ib.pag* 16. Such are deceived that ſay, Chriſt is diſtinct from His Saints. Moreover the *Quakers* Doctrins & Principles of the Prieſts in *Scotland pag* 33 in 'oppoſition to Mr. *Henry Foreſide*, who ſaid, that 'Chriſt mourned over Jeruſalem as He was Humane; 'anſwer, as for the Word (Humane) it is not 'Scripture Language, it ſpeaketh not that Language. Certainly by this ſpeech of theſe *Quakers* no other thing can be underſtood, but that Chriſt hath no Humane Nature: For though the word (Humane) were not found in the Scripture, if the thing imported by it be found in Scripture; then they muſt confeſſe themſelves to have been ridiculous, and purpoſeleſs pratlers, which *I* believe they will not do: and therefore its evident that they deny the Humane Nature of Chriſt. Again the *Quakers* ſpeak, as contemptibly of the Body and blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as if he were the baſeſt of Men, as theſe words of I*ſaac Peningtoun* witneſſe, *can outward blood cleanſe? We muſt enquire therefore*, ſaith he, *whether it was the blood of the Vail? Or of that Spiritual Man*, viz. *of* Fleſh, Blood, *and bones which took on Him the Vail, or Humane Nature? And the Myſtery of iniquitie Lyeth in the Blood of Chriſt*, ſayeth Edward Billings: And *Hubberthorn* in his reply to Mr. *Sherlock* who had ſaid, *that Chriſt was not capable of Faith and* Repentance, ſaith, *here I charge thee to be a lyar, and Slanderer; for he was capable of Faith, and* Repentance. What then is clearer than that according to theſe Mens Doctrine, the Spotleſs Lamb of God was really defiled with ſin and ſtood in need of another Saviour to believe in? Moreover (as we have already heard) they ſtill diſtinguiſh between the outward & inward body of Chriſt, wickedly & abſurdly aſcribing to their imaginarie inward body of Chriſt, all that the Scripture attributeth to the Bleſſed Body of Chriſt, that dyed at *Jeruſalem*, ſuch as ſufferings, Death, Reſurrection, and the like, by which diſtinction they render as much as in them lyeth, the paſſion, Death and Reſurrection of our Lord Jeſus at *Jeruſalem*, altogether vain and idle actions. And in favours of this their inward body, they call the body that our Lord took of the Virgin *Mary*, only a garment: and that it's no conſtituent of Chriſt; and that *Luke* 2. 26. Where its ſaid, that it was revealed to Simeon, *that he ſhould not dye, till he ſhould ſee the Lord's Chriſt, is to be underſtood of a Spiritual ſight, or of ſeeing the Chriſt within, Will. Pen. Rej. to John Faldo* part 2th: c. 9.

4. As theſe men deny Chriſt himſelf, ſo they deny conſequently all the benefits purchaſed by him: For they ſay that Chriſt dyed only to be a pattern and example to Believers; hence *Will.* Pen: *ſandy found:* pag. 26 ſayeth, *unleſs we become doers of that* Law, *which Chriſt came not to deſtroy, but as our example to fulfill, we can never be Juſtified before God: Nor let any fancy that Chriſt hath ſo fulfilled it for them, as to exclude their obedience from being requiſite to their acceptance, but only as their pattern.* Thus it is evident that the *Quakers* are altogether

Socinians in their Judgments of the ends of the death of Chriſt, and ſo joyn themſelves cloſs with them, and Papiſts in the Doctrine of Juſtification; yea, R*ob.* B*ar.* denieth not but that his Doctrine of Juſtification is all one with that of the Counſel of *Trent.* For the proof of which let the reader compare Mr. *Brown* Chap. 13. N. 8. with R*ob.* *Barclay* his *Vindication Sect.* 8. *N.* 1. and *Apol, p.* 137. 139. He accuſeth *Luther*, and the Body of the Primitive proteſtants, as *great depravers of the Doctrine of Juſtification, & doers of as great hurt by this their doctrine, as ever they did good, by what they broke down of Babylon.*

But *I* will give you their doctrine yet more fully in their own words, & firſt *Will.* Pen, *ſerious Apol:* pag 148. Hath theſe words. "and indeed this we deny *viz.*
' Juſtification by the righteouſneſs that Chriſt ful-
' filled in his own perſon for us; wholly without us,
' and boldly affirm in the Name of the Lord to be
' a doctrine of Devils, and an arm of the Sea of
' Corruption, which now doth deludge the World.
And again *Edward Burrows p.* 33. To that query of Philip *Binnet* viz. 'Whether none be accounted
' righteous in the ſight of God, in whom is any
' Corruption, or failing, or who do not fulfill the
' Law, and anſwer every demand of Juſtice? Anſwereth thus, ' Here thou polluted Beaſt makes
' it manifeſt what thou haſt been driving at all this
' while; which is that thou would have thy corrupti-
' on, and filthineſs to be accounted righteouſneſs in
' Gods ſight. that ſo thou mayeſt wallow in filthi-
' neſs; but *John* ſayeth, he that commits ſin is
' of the *Devil*, the Son of God was manifeſted that

‘he might deſtroy the works of the Devil, and
‘thou Man of Sin would have it ſtand. God do-
‘eth not accept any, where there is any failing, or
‘who do not fullfill the Law, and anſwer every
‘demand of Juſtice. And *Will. Pen Reaſ:* againſt
‘*Rail. pag* 80. We muſt not conceive that his, *viz*
‘*Abrahams* perſonal offering, was not a juſtifying
‘righteouſneſs, but that God was pleaſed to count
‘it ſo; nor was there any imputation of anothers
‘Righteouſneſs to *Abraham*: but on the contrary,
‘his perſonal obedience, was the ground of that
‘juſt imputation, therefore that any ſhould be
‘juſtified by anothers righteouſneſs imputed, and
‘not inherent in him, is both ridiculous, and
‘dangerous. *Edward Burrows pag* 32. ‘Thou Beaſt
‘to whom the plagues of God are due, and upon
‘whom the wrath of God muſt be accompliſhed,
‘who would have another righteouſneſs than that
‘which Chriſt worketh in the Saints. *Pen. San:*
‘*Fund: pag* 25. Juſtification is not from the impu-
‘tation of anothers Righteouſneſs, but from the
‘actual performing, and keeping of Gods righte-
‘ous ſtatutes, *ibid. pag* 25.30. It is a great abomina-
‘tion to ſay, God ſhould condemn, and puniſh his
‘innocent Son, that he having ſatisfied for our ſins,
‘we might be juſtified by the imputation of
‘of his perfect righteouſneſs. Why ſhould this
‘horrible thing be contended for by Chriſtians.

5. With the like facility I could ſhew, that the Doctrine of the *Quakers* is in every point contrarie to the Doctrine of Chriſt; contradicting, and vilifying all his Ordinances, and denying all

his benefits. I ſhall content my ſelf with one great inſtance viz. *Of the Reſurrection of the dead.* Concerning which point, the *Quakers* are down-right *Sadducees*: For, in the hearing of many witneſſes *Geo: Whitehead* ſaid, *This Body ſhall not riſe again.* Hicks *Quak:* appeal anſ. *pag* 21. and *Will: pen.* Reaſ. againſt *Rail. p.* 133. Such a Reſurrection is ' inconſiſtent with the Scripture Reaſon, and the ' belief of all Men right in their wits. And *Ibid:* ' *pag* 34. For ſhame, Let us not make ſuch ſtirr ' againſt the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, for the ' abſurdity of that is rather outdone, than equaled by this carnal Reſurrection: And the ſame *William Pen* in his *Invalidity*, (I ſhould have ſaid his Validitie, ſeeing he all along Juſtifieth his adverſaries charges) of Mr. *Faldos Vindication*, hath a Chapter prolix enough to defend his down right *Sadduciſm*. Yea what is more clear in all the Scriptures than Chriſts viſible appearance to judgment: And yet *Geo: Whith. Chriſt Aſcended* (ſo, that according to him he ſhall never deſcend) *pag* 22. Sayeth, 'they are like to be deceived, who are expecting that Chriſts ſecond coming will be a perſonal coming. And *Ib.* ' he denyeth, that he ſhall ' come viſibly; for although, ſayeth he, *He* ſhall ' come in the like manner, yet every like is not ' the ſame. And no wonder it is, that the *Quakers* deny the viſible return of Chriſt to Judgement, ſeing they deny that Chriſt hath any perſonal being without men. Thus ſpeaketh the ſame Author *pag* 18. And again *pag* 69. *Chriſt in perſon, remot in a Body of Fleſh, and not in Men, is not Scrip-*

Scripture Language; *but added.* But it is needleſs to adduce moe paſſages to ſhew the deteſtableneſs of this Seck, enough being ſaid already to diſcover it. *I* ſhall only add the words of a Leading *Quaker* related by *Hicks Quak: Appeal: Anſ. pag* 12. who being asked what he thought of Chriſt Jeſus born at *Bethlehem*, and dying at *Jeruſalem*? anſwered, *Jeſus Chriſt at Jeruſalem a Type, a Figure, a ſhadow that is paſſed away; what have you to do with Chriſt at Jeruſalem; have done with him.* From all this it is evident, that according to the *Quakers*, there is not ſuch a thing now in beeing, as Chriſt Jeſus that died at Jeruſalem. And as they deny Chriſt the *S*on of God, ſo they arrogat to themſelves by a moſt Diabolical Sacriledge, whatſoever the Holy Ghoſt in the Scriptures hath appropriated to Chriſt Jeſus; of which Lucifer-like aſpiring take a taſte, *Joſiah Coal* an eminent *Quaker*, thus writeth to *Geo: Fox*, ‘Dear *Geo: Fox* who art the Father of many Nations, whoſe liſe hath reached through us thy Children, even to the *Iſles* afar off, unto the begetting of many to a lively hope, for which generations to come ſhall call thee bleſſed, whoſe beeing, and habitation is in the power of the higheſt, in which thou rules, and *Go*verns in *R*ighteouſneſs, and thy Kingdom is Eſtabliſhed in peace, and the increaſe thereof without end: Date 21. day of the 12 *Mo*neth 1658. See *Tyr:* detected pag 19.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Perfection.

ALthough we have already given ſeveral inſtances of the damnable Doctrine of the *Quakers*, together with their miſerable defence thereof: We ſhall notwithſtanding for the more abundant evicting hereof, trace the Footſteps of one of their cheif Authors *Robert Barclay*, in his Vindication of one or two of their cheif principles.

The firſt of which ſhall be that of Perfection:

The Doctrine of the *Quakers* in this point, is, *In* 'whom this pure & holy birth is fully brought forth, 'the Body of death, and ſin, cometh to be crucified, and removed, and their hearts united, and 'ſubjected to the truth, ſo as not to obey any 'Suggeſtions, or Temptations of the evil one, to 'be free from actual ſinning, and Tranſgreſſing of 'the Law of God, and in that reſpect, perfect, 'Yet doth this perfection ſtill admit of a 'growth. And there remaineth alwayes in ſome 'part a poſſibility of ſinning; where the mind do'eth not moſt diligently, and watchfully attend 'unto the Lord.

Theſe are the words of his eight Theſe; And afterward he ſayeth, that, *there may be a State in this Life, in which a Man cannot ſin, it is ſo natural unto him to do* Righteouſneſs.

Let us in the next place conſider how he vindicateth this Doctrine, which is our main purpoſe. Having *vind: ſect: 9.* Spent a while in accuſing his Adverſarie as guilty of railing, and in rejecting his own Brethrens books; ſuch as *Sauls errand to Damaſcus.* In which they maintain themſelves to *be equal with God.* Which is alſo aſſerted by *Hubberthorn againſt* Sherl: *pag* 30. I ſay, rejecting theſe, or denying that they have ſaid them (for he ſtill inſinuateth that *Hicks* only ſaid theſe things, although it be evinced by particular citation of book and page, where they are;) In the next place he giveth away the cauſe wholly, by ſaying, 'that 'he pleadeth for no more than Mr. *Brown* ſayeth 'N 6. *viz.* That by perfection in this life, is under'ſtood a change in the whole man, ſo that he 'yieldeth impartial obedience to all the Com'mands of God, though in a ſmall degree, yet that he may ſeem to ſay ſomewhat, he enquireth, *How this Doctrine is reconciled with that of dayly breaking the Commands in thought, word, & deed?* In anſwer to which queſtion, it is enough to enquire how he evinceth them to be contradictory! Seing he may know if he will, that the *Law* of the Lord requireth a perfection of degrees, as well as parts, and that it is a diſconformity to the Law of God, and conſequently a ſin, to be deficient in the one, as well as in the other. And whereas he enquireth

eth; 'if to break Gods Commands dayly, in 'thought, word, and deed, be the way to grow in 'grace? 'To put off the Old Man, and on the 'New. He but only uſeth his old Cuſtom. viz, maliciouſly to calumniate. For who ſaid ſuch a thing? Or from what point of our Doctrine will he prove this? We ſhall attend his proofs of it. Which untill we hear, we cannot but in reaſon Judge that he delighteth in malicious lies. For though we ſay according to the Scripture, that even the regenerate carrie about a body of death with them until death, which defileth all their actions: Yet where did any of the reformed teach, that to endeavour to break Gods Commands is the way to grow in grace, as this Man inſinuateth they do? What kind of light is this he has, that teacheth him ſuch a facultie of lying?

He goeth on ſaying, *but he addeth that this perfection, rendereth goſpel commands uſeleſs, but are the Commands uſeleſs, if men obey them?* But certainly He that is above the breach of the Law, as the *Quakers* ſay, many may be, has no more uſe of the Law, or need of it to learn any thing from it, in order to the obedience thereof. And where is his vain ſubterfuge now? But that he may yet further contradict himſelf and his Brethren; He ſayeth, He has *ſhewn in his Apology, that all have need to repent, and pray for forgiveneſs.* 'For if ſome be equal with God, above the breach of the Commands, want a bodie of death: The moſt that they have to do, is to give thanks, and not to pray,or repent.For I think he will not ſay,that they pray,or repent which are in heaven.Theſe duties preſupponing ſorrow, of which they are incapable, And far leſſe (*Horreſco referens*) theſe that are equals with God.

In oppoſition to his Adverſary ſhewing that this Doctrine tendeth to the fomenting of pride, and ſecurity he ſayeth, *but where freedom from ſin is, where can* Pride *and* Security *have place?* Anſ. This anſwer had been as fit to the Apoſtles Queſtion *Rom.* 3, 27, as to this Argument. For he inferred that boaſting might follow upon Juſtification by works. It might then have been as well replyed? If a man be perfectly Juſt, and ſo without ſin, how can he incur the fault of boaſting? 2. How will he ſhew, but this *Doctrine* of his doth bring many under a miſtake, as if they were ſecure from ſinning, when indeed they are not? Whereas he ſayeth, *that according to our Doctrine denying the perfection of degrees in this Life*, *the wicked Villains do leſſe make uſeleſſe Gods Commands than others, becauſe they afford more matter, to exerciſe* Repentance, *and prayer for forgiveneſs of God*: We only refer him to Rom: 3. 8. where he may have the like Objection with a fit Anſwer. And here he promiſeth alwayes to cry down the Ordinances of Chriſt Jeſus. And why? Becauſe, ſayes he, *they muſt be made uſeful in breaking the Commands, in thought, word, and deed.* His reaſon is a Calumnie, if it have ſenſe at all. What Ordinance teacheth, which we maintain, that it is ones duty daylie to break the Commands of God, that the Ordinances may be the more uſeful to us ? If this be not of the ſame nature with Cavil wiped off by the Apoſtle *Rom* 3. then certainly two, and three, are not five. But ſuch malice the Church muſt reſolve to be the Butt of, ſo long as ſhe is militant.

He goeth on, to remove this Abſurdity from their Doctrine of *Perfection viz. that then none that are regenerat, could ſin at all, but would be beyond the poſſibility of it.* Which inference is very clear, for the ground which they give for their Doctrine is *Joh.* 3. 9. *He that is born of* God, *doeth not commit ſin.* Which place they abuſe, taking it without reſtriction; not attending to the context, ſpeaking of a Tread and Cuſtom of ſin, and of a commiſſion of it from Malice, like the devil, and the wicked, his Children. Which abſurdity, that he may evite: He aſſureth, *that a man is not regenerat, and born again at once, or at one inſtant of time.* His ground of which we ſhall now examine. And it is thoſe two places of Scripture, *viz. Phil.* 1. 6. *He which hath begun a good work, &c.* Gal. 5. 7. *Ye did run well, &c.* Now theſe Scriptures ſay nothing for him. For the *Philippians* were Saints in Chriſt Jeſus, when this Epiſtle was writ, v 1. Now I think, none can deny that ſuch are born of God. For the other Place it ſaith as little for him, except for it he would infer the Saints falling away, which is falſe.

Next that the new Birth of Regeneration, as ſuch doeth not admit of degrees, but that every one of the Children of God are really converted, or born again; ſo that of the Children of wrath, they become the Children of God, at one time, or Inſtant is clear. For as ſoon as a man hath true Faith, he becometh a Child of God. But that all that belongeth to the Eſſence of true Faith is infuſed in the Soul at once, (although ſome legal work in order to it neceſſarily preceed) I think none will deny. And the manifold Examples in Scripture, ſhewing that men in a moſt ſhort time, were made to turn from Satan to God, prove it. I would fain know if the Thief on the Croſſe, and Jailor were not born again? And if they were not perfectly born again? But to ſpeak of any imperfection in his new Birth as ſuch, that is to ſay, that one may be brought from Nature to Grace, and yet but half born again, or not fully born again; Becauſe he hath not attained unto the ful meaſure of Grace which is attainable, is no leſs abſurd than to ſay, that one is not fully born, becauſe he is but a little Child. Now this Abſurdity is not a little removed, becauſe what ever they can ſay, the like reaſon holdeth for the one, as well as for the other. Theſe to whom the Apoſtle writeth, were perfectly born of God, and yet there were ſome little Children among them; 1 *Joh.*2. 12. Now they were perfectly born; Becauſe they had the Seed of God, or the *Unction* chap 2. 27. which is all one with the Seed. Now the abiding of the Seed, is given as a reaſon of the perfection of the New-birth, ſo that they cannot ſin. *Ergo*: If little Children; as well as Fathers, had this *unction*, or *Seed* abiding in them

them, they had this New-birth in the higheſt perfection pleaded for by *Quakers.* 3 The Apoſtle, 1 *Joh* 3. 9. ſpeaketh without diſtinction, (*Whoſoever &c.*) and ſo taketh away the eluſion of our Adverſaries.

Next, he thinketh here to free himſelf of *Pelagianiſm*, of which he was proved to be guilty, by ſaying *he alwayes denyed that men might keep the Commands by the power of nature*, which groundleſs ſhift is overthrown above. chap 2. He alledgeth alſo, that becauſe the Fathers ſay, *That none by the ſtrength of Grace did live all their dayes without ſin; and the perfection aſcribed to ſome in Scripture, was not from nature, but from grace, therefore they thought men might be free from ſin by Grace.* What miſerable manking and clipping is this? Is it not added in the very following words immediatly? *That none attained that meaſure of holineſs in this life, that he could live any long time without ſin, and that this perfection was not full, and abſolute, but which might encreaſe, and was mixed with evil deeds, ſo was a perfection of parts only, not of degrees.* Theſe are the very words of the *Antitheſis* of the Orthodox, in oppoſition to the *Pelagians. Voſ. Hiſt. Pel. Par. Prim: Theſ.* 1. pag 146. Now I would deſire any to ſhew me, what this Doctrine differeth from that which the reformed Churches hold? Let the Reader ſee Mr. *Brown* himſelf pag 333, N 12, 13. where he may ſee this matter handled at large. I add theſe words of *Oroſius Apol. Cont: Pel: I do not undertake, I preſume not, I dare not ſay that I ſhall be without ſin, ſo* *long as I ſhall be in this Corruption, which we have.* And again, *The man that can be without ſin is Chriſt.* He ſaith here, *that what his* Adverſary *addeth of the* Fathers *arguments againſt* Pelagians, *and* Socinians *It is not his work to meddle with, or to heed what theſe* Sects *ſay.* But it is not beſt to do ſo. For in ſo doing, he ſhould fight againſt himſelf. For they muſt divide him from himſelf, that divide him either from a *Pelagian*, or a *Socinian*. I was about to admoniſh the *Reader*, to read eſpecially this fourteenth chapter of *Mr. Broun's* Book: But I need not, ſeing he granteth all we plead for, by ſaying on the matter, he doth not care though he be proved a *Pelagian*, and a *Socinian*. And whereas he ſayeth, *he conſidereth the matter as propoſed in Scripture.* The only way to know the truth of this, is to examine his Doctrine, which we have done in part. And through the *Lords* aſſiſtance, ſhall yet further do it. We value not his *Recriminations*, which he hath here, but nameth none, ſince nothing that he can ſay can be of weight againſt us: As theſe Charges of *Pelagianiſm*, and *Socinianiſm* are againſt him, except he bring the fathers as much fighting againſt the Doctrine of the reformed churches, and the reformed Churches againſt their Doctrine; as theſe fight againſt him, and his Brethren.

Again he cometh to the Vindication of his Arguments, which are anſwered by his Adverſary pag 337 N, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. *And* for urging of the firſt, which was, *That this Doctrine is againſt the wiſdom of God,* he only inſinuateth that there are means given to the people of God, whereby they may be free from all ſin, if they uſe them well. This I ſay he inſinuateth, for here he mumbleth as one in a confuſed haſte: But this is with as great facility denyed, as any thing he hath hitherto ſaid; For we aſſert, that it is the will of God, that perfect freedom from ſin, be a property of the Church Triumphant only. And for probation of our aſſertion, it is enough to challenge him to give any example of one, thus freed from ſin in the world, except Chriſt Jeſus, who never had it, but by imputation. To me his following words are nonſenſe. He would fain inſiſt over his Adverſary, becauſe he ſayeth pag. 339. N 19. *That the heart, & the renewed part of the man being for God and God only, and directly againſt Satan, and all his wayes, doings, and deſigns, there is no formal ſervice performed unto Satan*, Saying, *That then there is ſome material ſervice performed to the devil.* But this objection militateth as much againſt the Apoſtle, ſaying, *Rom.* 7, *That with his fleſh he ſerved the Law of ſin.* Which I think the *Quakers* will hardly diſtinguiſh from the Law of Satan. 2. If this inſtance do any thing, it will overdo. For it tendeth to prove that no Action of any that have gotten faith, though in the leaſt degree, can be at all tainted with ſin. We mean their gracious Actions: He is angry becauſe his Adverſary ſaith *that it is the will of God, that his people be under a warfare ſo long as they are here*, ſaying, *But is it the will of God, that they alwayes be overcome? Seing if their Actions ſtill be ſtained with ſin*, ſ

tha

that they may be called ſervice to Satan, they cannot but be ſaid to be overcome. Anſ. They are not alwayes overcome. Becauſe ſometimes the man as Spiritual, prevaileth againſt himſelf as carnal. And alwayes overcometh at length, and at the end of the War, though oftentimes foiled in particular Battels. The none conſideration of which diſtinction, is the ground of this Cavil, his following words ſtand, and fall with this Doctrine of Original ſin, and univerſal Grace, according to his own confeſſion, we ſhall therefore paſſe them.

Pag. 123. He repeateth his Argument, which is ' that our Doctrine is injurious to the Sacrifice of ' Chriſt. But he forgetteth to ſhew how. Only he ſayeth in oppoſition to his Adverſary, ſaying, " that the Guilt of ſin by by this Sacrifice, is ta' ken away: And alſo he taketh away the ſtain ' thereof piece and piece, till in end he give full ' Victory. They refer that to another Life. The Queſtion is concerning this.

Anſ. If he were minded to make a Difference betwixt Heaven, and Earth, he had not made a Queſtion about full Victory in this life. 2. How profane a Heart muſt he have, that counteth all the attainments of a Child of God in this Life, as good as nothing: For notwithſtanding of them all, he will ſtill have the Sacrifice of Chriſt to be uſeleſs, except a man in this Life, become as ſinleſs as an Angel. He was concerned to have proved this, otherwiſe not belied the World, by giving out that he had fully anſwered his Adverſary. But eſpecially he lieth here, in that he ſayeth he hath fully anſwered his eight Chapter. In which of all places, he moſt failed. Of which I ſhal give the Reader a touch in my *Appendix*. And may be more fully ſeen by theſe who compare the Books themſelves. He will not be content, that his Adverſary ſayeth, that the godly, and the wicked differ; In that the one ſinneth with full Purpoſe of Heart, and the other, viz. the godly mourneth over, and repenteth of his ſin, and ſhortcomings, but ſayeth, *ſeing he ſuppoſeth the godly to remain in ſin, all their lifetime the ſimilitude remaineth*. Anſ. And is it ſo? that there is no difference in ſinning, between him that ſinneth through Malice, and him that ſinneth through Infirmity, let him prove this. For until he do it, we account it an abominable Aſſertion. For the Scripture maketh a clear difference, between the ſhortcomings of the godly, and wicked departing from God. And is it no difference, that the one repenteth, and the other not?

Next he mentioneth another of his Apologetick Arguments viz. *that our Doctrine in this Point, maketh the Miniſtry uſeleſſe*. But in ſtead of urging, what his Adverſary anſwered, which was, " that upon this very head the Neceſſity of a Mi-
' niſtry appeareth. 2. That it cannot be proved,
' that this ultimat end of the Miniſtry mentioned
' Eph. 4, 13. is attained here, and 3. That
' there is a Perfection of Parts and another of
' Degrees. I ſay in ſtead of urging of all this, he only ſayeth, "but the Queſtion is, whether or not that perfection is attainable here? Anſ.

He ought to urge his Argument: And not propone Queſtions, ſeing he knoweth well enough that his Adverſary, as alwayes, ſo here denyeth that a ſinleſs perfection is attainable in this life. Now let him prove this from the place, and he may be conſidered. But in ſtead of this, for as ſhort as his Book is, he muſt make a Digreſſion to tell us, *that though Chriſt was ſinleſſe, yet he admitted of growth*, which is nothing to the purpoſe, ſeing Chriſt is not ſaid to grow in the Love of God, and ſuch moral Perfections, about which the Queſtion is; but only in that kind of Knowledge, the *pura neſcientia*, or want of which, is no ſin, or culpable Ignorance.

Next he ſayeth *it will not follow from Col.* 4, 12 *and* 1 *Theſ.* 3, 12. *that it is impoſſible that men ſhould be free of ſin here, by the Grace of God.* Theſe were the Places, from which he deduced an Argument, for ſinleſs perfection in his Apology. And now being anſwered, he thinks it enough for urging of them, to bid us prove the contrary, from the ſame places. Judge Reader, if this man be not pithy. And yet he hath all the pith, that *Socinus*, and *Crellius* had, from whom he learned the Argument.

His following Quibles are already anſwered. Only I muſt take notice that in this pag. 129. he enquireth, “How theſe can be ſaid, to have renounced the Works of darkneſs, who have need to be waſhed from their dayly Defilements? Anſ. Let him read the 12, and 13. of *Zechariah*. and there he may find that theſe two are conſiſtent. And as for his (how's) ſeing he will not ſee from the Scripture, they ought to have no other Anſwer. And whereas he venteth his Malice here in ſpecial, againſt the Presbyterians, we expect no other thing at his hand. For we know though Quakers, and Jeſuits have an inveterat Hatred againſt all Proteſtants: Yet in a ſpecial Manner their hate burneth againſt Presbyterians, knowing that theſe are furtheſt off from the Church of Rome.

Some others of his Apologetick Arguments he mentioneth, in the following page, but doth not ſo much, as attempt to urge them.

Next the Examples of *Enoch*, and *Noah*, he alſo mentioneth, and again taketh his old Shift viz. the Defendents part; ſaying, "how can we prove " that they were never without ſin? whileas *affirmanti incumbit probatio*. He doth not deny but they had once ſin. Now, ſeing he aſſerteth that at another time they were free of it altogether, he ought to prove it: And that by another Argument, than ſaying *If they had not been altogether free of ſin, they would not have been called perfect*. Seing that perfection is variouſly taken in Scripture, and not only for being free of ſin, as himſelf confeſſed above; ſeing he did not contradict what his Adverſary ſaid, about the Diverſity of the Signification of the Word.

He cometh in the next place to remove our Arguments. The firſt of them is drawn from 1 Joh. 2. 8. *If we ſay we have no ſin &c.* and here he ſayeth firſt, *that this will no more prove, that the*

Apoſtle John himſelf ſinned dayly, than what is ſaid James 3. 9, 10. *can be affirmed of the Apoſtle James himſelf.* Anſ. There is no parity. For James ſpeaketh of groſſe outbreakings, from which the Lords People are ordinarly kept. But here the Apoſtle ſpeaketh ſimply of the Nature of ſin. 2. Certain it is, that the Apoſtle John, even in his beſt frame, had ſinful Actions, and his own Errors. Which none will deny that readeth *Rev.* 19. 10, 11, and 22, 8, 9. and *I* think no Quaker will deny that John was perfectly born again if any ever was. Now let them quible what they will, theſe two Texts are enough to refute them. He alledgeth next, that his Adverſary only proveth from this place, that men may ſin in the preſent time, not that they do really and actually ſin in the preſent time. Which is falſe. For he from the Context fully refuteth the *Socinian* Cavil, ſee among other places; v. 9. he denyeth here that the Seed of ſin, maketh its Subject ſinful. But we know no *S*eed of *S*in, but that which is really Sin, neither doth the Scripture make any Mention of it. *B*ut this Doctrine is all one with the popiſh Doctrine of Concupiſcence *mutato nomine*.

He alledgeth pag. 126. *That it will not follow from Eccleſ.* 7. 20. *That men ſin dayly, or that all their Actions are imperfect through ſinning.* But he forgetteth to apply that Law to himſelf, which he would impoſe upon others. For though the Text ſpeaketh abſolutly, without exception: yet he will not give a Reaſon of a Reſtriction. And here again he talketh of his abſolute Regeneration. But to as little purpoſe as before. He leaveth the Conſideration of the Hebrew Text, which he thought made for him, to the Reader, therefore I conſidered it, and found it in the Indicative mood. And conſequently nothing for him.

He cometh next to vindicate the meaning of the *Socinians* and *Quakers* of Rom. 7, 17, which is, *that the Apoſtle there ſpeaketh of another, in his own perſon.* But he paſſeth all his Adverſaries Reaſons of our Meaning, with one blunt ſcoffe, ſaying *he giveth us a Preachment*; Which effrontedneſs I Judge can hardly be parallelled. Next he ſayeth, *except he prove that Paul was a Carnal man; in reſpect of ſinning at that time, he ſayeth nothing.* But his Adverſary hath done it, from this preſent Text already, ſo that he durſt not ſo much as preſent one of his Reaſons, to his Reader, though never ſo manked, and clipped (as his Cuſtom is) but thought it ſafeſt, to paſs by them whole ſale: Otherwiſe perhaps ſome of the Vulgar Quakers, who deluded by this Emiſſary of the Jeſuits, might have ſeen how abſurd their *Rabbies* are in explication of the Scripture, and ſo looked about them; before they had been further involved. 2. All this effronted, and falſe dealing will not do the turn; For the Reaſon why they reject ſuch a plain meaning of the words, and admit ſuch a ſtrange figurative meaning. The reaſon I ſay, moving them to this, is becauſe they think the Apoſtle Paul was above ſinning, and that they may have him to be an Example of ſinleſs perfection, but this helpeth him not a whit. For the Apoſtle *John*, was one of the chief Apoſtles, as well as *Paul*, and yet his ſinning in his choiceſt Frame, and under the greateſt outlettings of Grace, is ſo manifeſt, that all the Sophiſtry of Satan hath not yet invented a Shift, for the Eluſion thereof. The like may be ſaid of Peter. *Gal.*2. and many others which we paſſe.

Next he cometh to anſwer *Mr. Browns* Argument which is this.

If we find no inſtances in Scripture of ſuch Perſons, as were ſo perfect, as that they did not ſin, then to imagine ſuch a Perfection, is but a groundleſs fancy, and dream.

But the Former is true.

The Conſequence he denyeth. And conſequently he denyeth that we ought to walk according to the guidance of the Scripture. And where is his holding by the Scriptures now, which we lately heard of? Let *Quakers* therefore no more cheat the World, with ſaying, that they walk according to the Scriptures, while with open face they aſſert, that they ought not to be a guide to us, or that we ought to believe points of Faith not contained there. 2. He ſayeth that the Argument concludeth not in the Terms of the Queſtion. But the Concluſion is, that ſuch a Perfection, as the Quakers maintain, is but a fancy, and a Dream. And if he will admit this, we are agreed. And if he will not, he muſt deny ſome of the propoſitions. Neither let him object to me, that this is not the Argument; which he anſwered unto (for the Argument was proponed three different wayes, the firſt of which he chooſed to anſwer unto,) For either it is it, or another; if it be it, it is well: the ſame Argument then is now urged, if it be not it, then let him confeſſe he skipt over, that which did cut this point of Quakeriſm in the jugular Vein.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Quakers *Doctrine, of Silent Worſhip, and of the Sacraments.*

THis Author, in the 12 *Section* of his *Vindication*, of which the firſt part is oppoſed to *Mr. Broun*'s 22 Chapter of *Silent waiting*, maketh a none ſuch clamour, as if he were without paralel traduced. We ſhall therefore in the firſt place conſider the chief of theſe things, which he calleth Calumnies and Perverſions. Whereof the firſt is, *That he would have us to underſtand that Chriſt's Reſurrection was never till now, whereas* (ſayes he) *I only ſpake with reference to the time ſince the Apoſtacy.* Anſ. 1. Any may judge by his 11 *Propoſition*, or yet by his chapter annexed thereto, if this be a Calumny; for whatever he there ſayeth, may be as well applyed, to Heathniſh, as Popiſh ſu-

ſuperſtition, eſpecially if the Quakers ſalvation of Heathens be conſidered. 2. He is unhappy in removing his pretended Calumny: For the Apoſtacy was working in the Apoſtles time, and conſequently he ſayeth nothing. 3. Make the beſt of it ye will, this is but only what *Munſer*, or *John of Leyden* ſaid, that they might obſcure theſe burning and ſhining Lights, the reformers, and marr the work in their hand. 4. Their direct oppoſition to the Orthodox primitive Chriſtians, in the moſt weighty points of Religion; ſuch as the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, *Free-grace*, the *Sacraments*, and the like ſufficiently demonſtrats, that they eſteem none before themſelves, except *Arrius*, *or* *Pelagius*, to have been at all in the way of God. And therefore that hitherto there hath been no ſpiritual reſurrection. His ſecond Calumny ſo called, *viz.* that *Quakers plead only for Enthuſiaſms*, *and abſtract from means*, we have above evinced to be a truth, in the firſt and ſecond Chapters. Moreover, he here denyeth, that ſtudying of Sermons from the Scripture, which implyeth reading, prayer, and Meditations, and the like exerciſe to be means appointed by God. And thus he only confirms what he even now denyed, viz *that the Quakers plead only for Enthuſiaſms*, and abſtract from means. His third Calumny, viz. *that the Quakers Spiritual life is nothing but Nature.* we proved above Cap. 2. to be a truth, where we ſhewed that all the *Quakers* grace and light is nothing but the ſmall remainders of the once bright ſhining Image of God in man. His fourth Calumny is his own, and not his Adverſaries : For his Adverſary only inquireth, *If this Life be common at all times to them ?* Hence he inferreth, that he ſuppoſeth it to be ſo, the contrary of which , for any thing I can learn, he ſuppoſeth, as his Query *pag* 414. inſinuateth,His 5 Calumny. as to what truth it hath, dependeth upon the controverſie of *perfection*, to which he referreth his Reader, and I do the like to my ſurvey of his Vindication. His next nominal Calumny is, that his Adverſary *ſuppoſeth it to be their Doctrine,that there is no ſetting about prayers, or other duties, Without a previous motion of the Spirit.* Now of all things, I wonder moſt, that he calls this a Calumny, ſeing this very thing is aſſerted by himſelf, in his eleventh propoſition : How he will reconcile himſelf with himſelf I know not well. Yet ſure his following words are ſo far from mending the matter that they make it worſe, which are,*That they ſpeak not of a previous motion in order of time, but in order of nature*; Neither his propoſition, nor any part of his Doctrine, for any thing can be learned, inſinuateth any ſuch thing. 2. This motion muſt ſo far preceed the ſetting about duty , as that the perſons perception of the motion muſt be interjacent, according to them. For they teach that before duty, we muſt not only be acted by the *Spirit*, but know that we are acted : Ergo the motion muſt be previous in order of time. And yet the man is ſo fraughted with a deſire of altercation, that he muſt ſay ſome what,though he have not much advantage by it : otherwiſe he had not challenged his Adverſary, as a Calumniator, while by the ſame very expreſſion taxed by himſelf, he is forced to a diſtinction, unheard of heretofore as I think in this matter; and in reality a real contradiction of his own Principles. And again he alledgeth he is wronged, becauſe his Antagoniſt inferreth from his words, in his eleventh Propoſition; That according to him Goſpel-worſhip putteth away all external Actions. But he needeth not grudge at this, for their practiſe helpeth us to expone their words. Some other things he hath which he calleth Calumnies. One thing he taketh very ill, and that is, that his Antagoniſt pag 418. compareth the *Quakers* to the old *Pythonicks*, becauſe of the ſtrange and unuſual motions among them, Antick fits, and ſtrange Pranks. I alwayes compared them in ſuch fits to the *Cumean Cybil*, as ſhe is deſcribed by *Virgil* in his 6 Eneid. To this he retorts *the extraordinary working of the Spirit of God, mentioned in the fulfilling of the Scripture, called the Stwarton ſickneſs*: challenging us to aſſign a difference, between this and the ſtrange influence of the *Quakers* ſpirit upon them, which we can with great facility do; for beſide that theſe out-lettings of the Spirit of God, made them to cleave more cloſly to the Scriptures, as the only Rule, and Star, to guide them through the ſea of this world; to the ſafe port of their eternal reſt. And endeared more and more unto the Miniſters of Chriſt Jeſus, his word, and Sacraments, we mean that which the *Quakers call Water-Baptiſm*, & *the Communion of the* Lords *Body, in* Bread *and Wine*, as ſure pledges of the Love of Chriſt, commanded by him to be uſed until his coming to Judgment, which are openly contemned and vilified by the Quakers ; We ſay beſide this, theſe outlettings were far from leading them into ſuch ſtrange and unheard of fits, as the *Quakers* are put into : of which I could inſtance a Legion of ſure Examples, ſee a late piece written by a new *Engliſh* Miniſter *Mr* .*Increaſe Meather*. See alſo *Paget's Hereſiography* , where he bringeth among other ſtrange Pranks of theirs, to which they were moved by the Spirit, One *Suſanna Parſons* a zealous *Quaker*, attempting to raiſe one of their number, who had murdered himſelf, from the dead, but in vain. And this is atteſted by all the Magiſtrats of a conſiderable City in *England*, *viz*. *Worſter* Anno 1659. See alſo a little piece called *Foot out of ſnare* , of the ſtrange and antick influences of this their Spirit on one *John Toldervei*. What ſhall we ſay of *James Naylor*, who following the Light of this Spirit, did arrogat to himſelf divine honour at *Briſtol*. Now though they ſay, he recanted this again, it is all one matter : For this Antiſcriptural Spirit, which is their principal Rule, can no doubt change it ſelf, as it ſeeth occaſion : And having too much bewrayed it ſelf with the groſſneſs of its Deluſion, can eaſily turn it ſelf to a more ſubtile way of impoſture. So that we may in a word ſay, that the difference between the workings of the Spirit of God, on his people mentioned in Scripture and theſe of the father of lies, and deceits on the *Pythonicks* or *Cybills*, was no more palpable , than the difference between the working upon theſe mentioned by him, and that upon the *Quakers*. He ſayeth moreover, *that the ſtory of Gilpin, who as Paget ſheweth*

ſheweth us, was mad through Quakeriſm, *is refuted long ago.* But forgetteth to tell by whom or where. Next he cometh to wipe off the abſurdity of their ſilent waiting, that this their abſtracting of their mind from all thoughts, ſo that the ſoul doth not at all act upon any kind of Object. Which poſture they ſay prepareth them for the Spirits motion. *And* this is the reſult of their aſſerting, that a man ought to do nothing of the Service, or Worſhip of God, except they know that they are moved thereto by the Spirit. Now ſuch an inturning (for he counteth it a great wrong in his Adverſary to call it introverſion) is not poſſible unto a man, except he be ſleeping, as the experience of the generality of men witneſſeth, who ſtill perceive their Souls acting upon ſome Object, either good, or evil, except they be ſleeping, or in an extaſie: And ſo this is a direct following of the Heathens, who went and ſleeped at the Temples, or Groves of their gods, that they might have conference with them in dreams. But they uſed to take ſheep-skins and ly upon, as *Virg.* in his 7 Book, ſpeaking of *Latinus,* which if the *Quakers* do, or not, I am uncertain. Now in his defence of this pag: 147 being challenged as guilty of this abſurdity by his Antagoniſt, among other words, he hath theſe viz. *If he would underſtand it of the old man, the man of ſin, that is corrupted, we wil ſay with the Apoſtle, that it ought to be crucified, and die.* And again he ſayeth, *that albeit in one ſenſe, they are ſaid to die, yet they more truely live, and exiſt,* citing *Gal.* 2, 20. And this is the ſubſtance of what he ſayeth, on this point.

To which I anſwer, it is well that at length, they forſake their prime Opinion, or Characteriſtical note. Hitherto he with his brethren, were defending the relinquiſhing of all thoughts whatſoever, in order to the Spirits Motion, and our ſetting about of duty, now he only defendeth the leaving of Carnal thoughts. But he doth not conſider, that this Cheat will eaſily be perceived: For there is a time to be preſuppoſed, in which the Spirit is not moving: For I hope he moveth when, and where he liſteth. Now I ſay at this time, as man cannot Act, yea or think warrantably, of the things of God, according to them: Becauſe the Spirit is the principal Rule to them, therefore whatever is not done by this inward Command, is not of Faith, and conſequently ſin. All which they plead for. Therefore before this motion come, a man may not excerciſe his mind concerning religious matters and thoughts, to endeavour to love, fear, and walk with God, now is this only to relinquiſh carnal thoughts, or the thoughts of carnal things? Or was the Apoſtles living, or Chriſt in him by the life of Mortification, and *Faith* a meer abſtracting from all Exerciſe of the faculties of the *Soul*. This I think none will ſay, exerciſing reaſon: And yet this he muſt ſay, if he ſpeak according to his Principles, otherwiſe they will be neceſſitate to let their reaſonings againſt all worſhip, to which we are premoved by a ſenſible Enthuſiaſm, or Inſpiration of the Spirit, fall to the ground, which is the ſubſtance of *Skeen's* Queries, of which he boaſteth.

2. We come to the Vindication of ſome Arguments,

ments, which by him are called *Nibling quibles*.

The firſt is, *If there be times appointed by God, then according to them the Spirit is limited.* To which he anſwereth, *that they limit times of worſhip ſo as not to exclude other times.* But this anſwer preſuppoſeth, that every duty doth not prerequire immediat Inſpiration, which is falſe according to them, as *George Keith* endeavoureth to prove in his book of Immed: Rev: and to defend in his diſput with Aberdeen Students. 2. Either theſe times appointed by them which recur weekly, are appointed by God, or not: If they be not, then how dare they keep them, as a thing inviolable? Seing the Lord determineth the time, as well as the nature of the worſhip to his people. And *Jeroboam* 1 Kings 13. Is condemned for appointing an Anniverſary day, not appointed by God, as well as for changing the Religion. Ergo they limit the Spirit in appointing a day, perpetually recurring, or elſe they have a previous motion, in order to the appointing of every meeting; which he doth not aſſert, or grant. Here he ſayeth, *he followeth Calvin, in denying the Sabbaths morality, from whom, as alſo the generality of Proteſtants we differ in this matter.* But that he may ſee his miſtake herein, and that we neither differ from *Calvin* in his more deliberat thoughts, nor from the generality of Proteſtants: He may ready learned *Crawfords Apologetical* Exercitation *for the morality of the* Sabbath *day*, Cap. 2. And there beſide both the Fathers, & generality of Proteſtants, he may find that *Calvin* himſelf, in his Commentary on the *Gen:* written 27 years after the *Inſtitu-*

tions, ſayeth the ſame that we do. Let him ſee alſo moſt Learned *Torretin* on this head, who at large vindicateth *Calvin* from this *Imputation*. Next he ſayeth, *That none can be fitter for the Worſhip of God, than ſuch as make ſilence, and in turning of the mind neceſſary to their entry to Worſhip.* And thus he thinketh he has anſwered his Adverſaries Argument *pag* 413, againſt their Worſhip, drawn from the *Quakers* want of preparation. *But* if this inturning were an abſtracting from worldly things only, and looking unto God, and conſidering our own ſinful ſtate and frame, and the neceſſity of holineſs, in order to approaching unto God, he would ſay well: *But* ſeing in the ſame page, and with the ſame breath he reaſoneth againſt this alſo, ridiculouſly ſaying, *that then there ſhould be a progreſſus in infinitum*, he only confirmeth that which we have proved before, *viz*. That the *Quakers* ſilent waiting is a meer Extaſie, or all one with ſleeping: *A*nd contradicteth what he ſaid even now abov Here he alledgeth that the Apoſtles, if they ha pleaſed, might have written moe Books of Scripture, than they wrot: and ſeing they wrote the not I doubt not but the Apoſtles, if this be tru may be taxed of neglect of their Duty. For think he will not deny but theſe Books had bee very uſeful, and that the Apoſtles were oblige to lay out themſelves for the Churches good, much as they could. The Scriptures brought his Apology for this ſilent waiting, he forgette to preſſe, therefore his Adverſary anſwers to hi inference from them, muſt ſtand till he find ti to reinſtaure his Arguments. He referreth us to *George Keith his way caſt up*, inſinuating, that he is the man can prove this Silent waiting. But he will juſt prove it, as he has done, as ſoon as any judgeth his Book worthy of an anſwer: Otherwiſe might he not have borrowed ſome of his Brothers Arguments, to refute his Adverſaries Anſwers; as well as throughout the whole of his Books be a debter to *Pelagius*, *Bellarmin*, *Socinus*, *Oſtorodius*, *Volkellius*, and the like, rather than laid ſtark nought. Here he granteth that Peter and Paul had a natural man, in which the Devil might work, and a Spiritual man, which can reſiſt, and ſo contradicteth his Doctrine of Perfection, or at leaſt his explication of the 7 of the *Rom.* for if this be true, there is no ground for explaining that place of another then the Apoſtle himſelf.

His following words are arhapſodie or railing, in which he all along accuſeth his adverſarie, calling him, and his Brethren *Prieſts* (ſubintellige, of *Baal*, for ſo the *Quakers* ſpeak) *greedy Merchants of Babylon*, *perſecuters*, with more of ſuch ſtuff. Next he granteth, that *ceaſing to do evil is not without all action of the Minde*; E. when the *Quakers* think not at all, nor exerciſe the faculties of their ſoul, and conſequently have no action of the mind, which is their ſilent waiting, they never ceaſe to do evil. And it's like there be too much truth in this.

Becauſe his adverſarie ſayeth *pag* 424. *That watching is not a turning inward, but a looking outward*

ward alſo. Then ſayeth he *men ſhut up in a Dungeon could not watch Spiritually*, the repeating of which is more than the refuting. For well he knew that his adverſary underſtood by looking outwardly, minding of God, and our diſtance from him, and the like. Whereas what the *Quakers* mean by watching, and waiting, we heard above. Mr. *Brown* out of *Doctor Stillingfleet* of the Phanaticiſm of the Church of *Rome*, and out of the *S*ermons of one *Taulerus* a Phantaſtick Monk, applauded notwithſtanding by *Bellarmin*, and others of the chief Papiſts from *pag* 429, to the end of that Chapter, evinceth, that the Quakers in this point, not only in ſubſtance, but for the moſt part in expreſſions, agree exactly with the wildeſt dottages of P*opery*. To which he anſwereth that his adverſary miſſeth *his Aim*; *For he cannot prove, ſayeth he, that the chief preachers amongſt the* Quakers *ever heard of Taulerus*. Anſ. yea on the contrary he gaineth his deſign, for thus it is evinced that there is a great likneſs betwixt their genious's, which he confirmeth the more, while he granteth the truth of the bulk of what *Taulerus* ſayeth.

Section II. *Of* Baptiſm.

The contempt the *Quakers* vent againſt the *Sa*craments is ſo well known, that it will be ſuperfluous to tell the Reader in the entrie, that they deny them. See his 12. *Propoſition*, and his *Apology* thereto annexed. Vindication *pag* 162 He cometh to urge one of his *Apologetick* arguments againſt theſe Sacraments in general, viz. *That the many controverſies among Chriſtians about them, prove them to be a real phanſie. To which when his adverſary replyeth that if this argument hold, it will overthrow all the parts of the Chriſtian Religion.* He anſwereth *that he ſhould not have uſed this argument except he had other weighty ones.* And then he cryeth out upon his adverſary, *as ſhewing a malicious genious.* Judge, Reader, if he had reaſon ſo to cry out, and yet no better is the ground of his complaints through the whole of this Treatiſe. But to the main purpoſe, *Julian*, or *Porphyry* might as well have uſed this inſtance, as he; for they thought they had weighty Arguments againſt the Chriſtian Religion. And he doeth but meerly think, that he hath weighty arguments againſt the *Sacraments*, as in the Sequel ſhall appear. However in the mean time we may obſerve that this argument, as the moſt part of the reſt, is borrowed from the *Pagans*. For this very Argument drawn from the diviſion of Chriſtians, they improved what they could to overthrow Chriſtianitie. From them the Papiſts borrowed it, wherewith to impugne the Proteſtants. And laſtly the Quakers from them, and hath placed it where it was again at the firſt, to be a battering piece againſt Chriſtianitie in general. So it hath gone from hand to hand *in Circulo.*

Next he cometh to vindicat another argument borrowed from the *Papiſts*, in their pleadings for traditions againſt the Scriptures, viz. *that the word* (*Sacrament*) *is not to be found in Scripture*,

(take heed to the conſequence, Reader,) E. The thing is not in them. Is not this valid? But this Argument in its very defence, he is forced to let go, while he ſayeth, he denyeth not the thing truly imported by the *Trinity*. Very well then he can ſay no more of the Sacraments. For the thing ſignified is in the Scriptures, and the words (*Sign*, or Seal) by which (though he denyed) we very ordinarily expreſs that which we mean by (Sacraments) is very frequent in *Scripture*. And yet before he want ſomething to ſay, he will cavil; though he grant all we plead for before the cloſe, as here. Pag 163 *He* cometh to vindicate his meaning of ſome places of Scripture, brought in his *Apology* wherewith to overthrow Baptiſm, And firſt *Eph*. 4. 5. where he taketh notice that his Adverſary *Pag* 469, ſayeth 'that the *Scrip*- 'ture no where ſayeth, there is but one only Bap- 'tiſm. To which he replyeth, that it will as well 'prove, that there is but one only Baptiſm, as 'there is one only God. Anſ: Firſt true it is, that this Phraſe (*one only Baptiſm*) is not found in Scripture. 2. The one cannot be ſo well proved as the other. For theſe (ones) muſt be exponed, according to the ſubject matter, ſeing it is beyond debate, that it cannot be proved from this place, that there is but one only Faith, or no kinds thereof but one. The Phraſe therefore (One Baptiſm) will no more prove, that there are not diverſe kinds thereof, than the phraſe (one Faith) can do it in reſpect of diverſe kinds of Faith. If he think otherwiſe he ought to prove it, ſeing he is the opponent. Next he ſayeth ‘ That ‘his adverſary underſtandeth the extraordinary ‘ gifts of Tongues, and the like by Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and of fire. And hence ſaith he, *concludeth, that this Baptiſm is ceaſed. Anſ.* This is moſt true, which to prove, let him compare *Act.* 1. 5. with *Chap.* 2. For he cannot deny, that the Apoſtles had the Spirit of God before this promiſe, which is together with its fulfilling, *chap.* 2. an explication of the like phraſe in *Matth*, 3. 11. For the clearing of which I aſſert, that *Johns* Baptiſm, was no figure of the New Teſtament Baptiſm, in oppoſition to *Papiſts* and *Quakers*, who ſay it was only a figure of the New Teſtament Baptiſm. Otherwiſe if the ſign, which *John* could, only adminiſtrat, be oppoſed to the thing ſignified, we may underſtand the Baptiſm, with the Holy Ghoſt, and with the fire ſpoken of *Matth.* 3. of Sanctification and Mortification.

Next he ſayeth, *It is a lie that the Quakers would have none to be baptized, with the Spirit, but ſuch as have extraordinary Gifts.* But do they not ſtill boaſt of their Revelations, and inſpirations, comparing themſelves to the Apoſtles, calling themſelves perfect? and I think theſe are extraordinary things. And as for others beſide them, they call them only carnal, and ſay, they are in darkneſs, theſe are the moſt modeſt of their Expreſſions, and yet enough to prove the thing denyed. When his Antagoniſt telleth him in Oppoſition to his ſaying, *that if this Water-Baptiſm were to be accounted a true Baptiſm, then* *there ſhould be two Baptiſms, contrary to* Eph. 4. 5. I ſay when he telleth him, *that it might as wel be ſaid, that there were two Circumciſions under the Old Teſtament, one in the heart, another in the fleſh*; he granteth the Conſequence, and challengeth his Adverſary of Levity in uſing ſuch an Argument. Well then with as little abſurdity, we grant his Conſequence: *viz.* That in ſome ſenſe there are two Baptiſms in the Church, though in another Senſe, there be but one; *viz.* conſidered complexly of the Sign, it is underſtood in the place in hand; and indeed one might as well have reaſoned to preſſe Unity among the Jews, that there was but one Circumciſion, as the Apoſtle doth from the one Baptiſm. And for any thing I know, the Word Circumciſion is not uſed in the plural Number in the Scriptures. And if he ſay, that it is ſpoken of as twofold Rom. 2. 28, 29, I anſwer: ſo is Baptiſm ſpoken of. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

Another Reaſon of his Antagoniſt, againſt his meaning of this place, is, *that he may as well conclude from this place, that there is but one Faith, as that there is but one Baptiſm.* And yet there are diverſe kinds of Faith mentioned in Scripture, as ſometimes, for the Doctrine of Faith Gal. 1. 23. And for the outward Profeſſion of Faith. 1 Tim. 1. 19. The Faith of Miracles, or the like. To which he anſwereth, *that all theſe are included in the one Faith here ſpoken of. And to ſay that Baptiſm with water is included in that one Baptiſm is a begging of the Queſtion.*

ſtion. Anſ. It is no more a begging of the Queſtion, than that all theſe kinds of Faith are included in this one Faith. If he think otherwiſe, let him prove it. But he thinketh it rather fit to ſhift, and give naked aſſertions. For what Reaſon is there why the Baptiſm with water is not included in this one Baptiſm, more than that theſe other kinds of Faith, are not included? He may ſhew this if he pleaſe, for this is that which is incumbent to him to prove: That Baptiſm with Water is not included, as well as theſe various Kinds of Faith. 2. How will he prove that the Faith of Miracles is included in this one Faith? I do believe this will trouble him. And when he has done theſe two, then he may bring up his Achillean Argument, viz. *that ſuch as were baptized with water were not baptiſed; Therefore baptiſm with water is not the baptiſm of Chriſt.* Which Sophiſm might have been as well made againſt Circumciſion as Baptiſm, as we have but even now ſhown. He is angry at his Antagoniſt for telling him, that he hath ſtollen his Arguments from *Socinians*, ſaying, *he never read three lines of him.* Anſwer, neither did ever I hear one line in *Socinus* his own Book, yet I have heard an hundred of *Socinus* his Arguments. He miſerably bewrayeth his genious: For if he without reading of their Writings, ſtill fall upon the Socinian Arguments, then how near of kin muſt he and they be. But this he ſtill doth, as the whole Series of his Adverſaries Book declareth, ſtill citing the Book, and page of the Socinian Writings, where his Arguments are to be found. Which he dare not deny, whereas he ſhould vindicat pag. 164. his Doctrine built upon 1 Pet. 3. 21. he ſayeth meer nothing. But only *that his Adverſary giveth meer Aſſertions*. But he doth not attempt to impugn them. And is this urging, and Vindication of his Arguments. How deſperat muſt his Cauſe be! When he leaveth the very place, upon which they found the Abrogation of Baptiſm, without attempting to prove his own meaning of it. Next I ſay that whatever I can build upon this place, againſt Baptiſm with Water, the ſame Argument might have ſtill holden againſt Circumciſion in the fleſh: ſeing ſtill it was true, that he is not a Jew, that is one outwardly, and that that is not Circumciſion, which is outward in the fleſh, but that he is a Jew that is one inwardly, and that is Circumciſion that is of the Heart, and Spirit, and not of the Letter *&c*. Rom. 2. 28, 29. In a word whatever they ſhal ſay againſt Baptiſm with Water, from this place of *Peter*, there is ſtill as much to be ſaid againſt Circumciſion with hands, even during the Law, flowing from the perpetual Truth of this place of Paul to the Rom: But I think themſelves will not ſay, it militates any thing againſt Circumciſion made with hands, during the Law. Ergo they ought to conclude nothing from this place of Peter againſt Baptiſm with Water. Here he ſayeth *that his Adverſaries anſwer to this*

Argument from this place of Peter. and *Gal.* 3: 27. *Col.* 2, 12, *is built upon the Suppoſition, that Water-Baptiſm goeth to the making up of Chriſts Baptiſm.* And then ſayeth, *he will expect his proof of his expoſition of theſe places*, is not that fair arguing, Reader, to frame an Argument from a place of Scripture, and when the Defendent denyeth ſuch a thing followeth from this *Scripture*, to tell him he has loſt the Cauſe, unleſs that he prove that it will not follow? *But* ſeing he is the impugner in this place, if he had not intended to expoſe himſelf, and his party to ſcorn, he had certainly at leaſt attempted to prove his own Expoſitions of theſe places, and urged his two Arguments, which in his *Apology* were *in modo & figura*. But this heat of diſpute was ſoon allayed; For ſo hath his Antagoniſt combated with him, that he eſſayeth not to reinforce them. See pag. 473. 479. How ſeared muſt theſe Mens Conſciences be! when they endeavour to put a cheat upon the World in ſo weighty a buſineſs. 2. It's moſt groundleſs to ſay, that there is any *petitio principij* here, as the Quaker inſinuateth.

Next he cometh to reply to his adverſaries 9. *Num*: Where he had evinced that *Johns* Baptiſm was not a figure of Chriſts. And paſſing the marrow of what he had ſaid, he only compendizeth his Apologie, ſaying, *that Johns Baptiſm was a waſhing with Water, & that the Apoſtle aſcribeth the putting on Chriſt to the Baptiſm of Chriſt, as Waſhing with water Typifieth or ſignifieth the waſhing of regeneration, ſo doth Johns* Baptiſm *that of Chriſt*. But all this was obviat before, while his adverſary anſwered his Argument, wherewith he intended to prove his third propoſition, denying, that the Baptiſm of Chriſt is only the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and with fire: aſſerting alſo, and that upon good grounds, *that the Baptiſm with water is Chriſts Baptiſm inſtituted by Him*, ſee the Forecited Numb.

Next *I* ſay that *Johns* Baptiſm, as being inſtitute by Chriſt, and comprehending the thing ſignified, is not only Baptiſm with water, but Chriſts whole true Baptiſm, and ſo this quibling is groundleſs.

Neither is that which followeth any ſolider, where he ſayeth becauſe his adverſary denyeth, (*he muſt encreaſe, but I muſt decreaſe*) to be meaned of the abolition of *Johns* Baptiſm, *that then if this be meaned of their perſons, John grew more decrepit, and Chriſt more tall*, *Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis*? Was there not another member of the disjunction? I anſwer therefore to this miſerable cavil, that the meaning of the place is, that the perſon of Chriſt was to grow more and more in honour, and glory, ſo that within a little the fame, and repute of *John* was to be eclipſed through the brightneſs and ſplendour of Chriſt.

Next he ſayeth, that *though John had a command for baptiſm, it will not follow that it was no legal rite.* Anſ. *It* will well follow; for all the legal Rites, ſuch as held forth Chriſt, and his benefits by way of Type, to the whole Church, which each Member was to practiſe, were either inſtitute by Moſes, or before him. The deſign of which was that the people might ſee Chriſt, though darklie as in a Glaſs, untill the time of his coming, therefore this could not be a legal Rite, which was commanded directly at the coming of the Meſſias, and at his verie appearance, preaching to the world, when there could be no uſe of legal *Rites*, but theſe which were within a little to be aboliſhed. 2. All the *Legal Rites* are abrogat in the New Teſtament, but no where is the command given to John recalled, and his Baptiſm abrogat: Otherwiſe let him ſhow me the place of Scripture, (But not 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. which they ordinarilie uſe.) Either immediatly given by God, or the Apoſtles contrary approved practiſe equivalent to a Command. 3. That the *B*aptiſm of John was a Goſpel Ordinance is clear from *Mat.* 11. 12, 13. Where it is ſaid, *that the* Law *and the Prophets propheſied until Joh.* To which place, *I* know they ordinarily anſwer, that (untill) doth not exclude John But this is refuted abundantly by the former verſ. For in the time of the Law the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be ſaid to ſuffer violence, and yet it ſuffered Violence in the dayes of John. And certain it is that this particle, if it be not taken excluſively here, can be ſo taken no where elſe in Scripture, as the collation of this with other places will evince. 4. No legal thing, perſon, or Rite was propheſied of in the Old Teſtament, but John was clearly propheſied of, as a ſweet *G*oſpel *M*iniſter. E. *T*here is no reaſon to Judge, that John was a *Legal* Miniſter, or had *L*egal commands.

Next he cometh to vindicate what he deduced from 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Where he only ſeeketh to ſhift, neglecting whollie what his adverſary ſayeth, ſee *Pag.* 476. N. 12.

The firſt of theſe ſhiftings are, That becauſe his Antagoniſt ſayeth, *why did Paul baptiſe, if he had not a Commiſſion?* He anſwereth, *that this a qudrrelling with the Apoſtle.* What ſtrange diſingenuitie is this? To ſay, he quarrelleth with the Apoſtle, when he only quarrelled with the Quakers expoſition. And upon the ſuppoſed truth of this inferred this abſurditie, that the Apoſtle did that which he ought not to do, which being falſe, his expoſition cannot be true. Thus a *Man* might ſay ſtill, when one inferred an abſurditie from his expoſition of a place of Scripture, that he were fixing abſurdities upon the Spirit of God. For he knoweth that we expone Pauls words (that he was not ſent to baptiſe) for the leſſe principal part of his errand, according to *Hoſ*: 6. 6. *Matth*: 9. *Jer*: 2. 23. and many other places, even though there be no explicative clauſe following, as he alledgeth is in *Hoſ.* 6. 6. providing that there be no abſurditie following upon this gloſs. And beſide this, there are good reaſons why we ſhould ſo expone the phraſe here. For firſt the Apoſtle inſinuateth clearly, that all theſe Corinthians were Baptiſed, without reproving them for it. Whereas he ſtill reproveth the Gentiles for uſing of, and tenaciouſly ſticking to Jewiſh Rites, or any man that impoſed them upon them, either by example, or doctrine, as the body of the Epiſtle to the *Gal.* doth declare. 2. he doth not ſay, that his Fellow-Apoſtles were not ſent to baptiſe, but nameth himſelf alone. 3. He ſtill did adminiſtrat this Sacrament to the Gentiles, upon their embracing of Chriſtianity, as his recorded practiſe doth declare, which *Mr. Brown* hath ſhewed, but the *Quaker* moſt diſingenuouſly paſſeth over; let him not therefore object, that to expone the like phraſe, where the thing is ſaid *not to be*, for to be *leſs principal would make wild work*: Seing we give ſufficient reaſons for our explication of this place, and do not plead for the phraſe to be ſtill ſo exponed, but only where the Nature of the ſubject matter will permit it.

3. He cometh *pag* 166. to anſwer our argument from *Matth*: 28, 19. And firſt he denyeth that the Apoſtles while Chriſt was with them, baptiſed with Chriſts warrand; and ſayeth, he will wait his adverſaries proof of it. Anſ: He hath done it already from *John* 3. 26 and, 4, 3. Of which places the *Quaker* durſt not adventure to take notice. We ſhall therefore wait what he ſayeth the next time againſt them. 2. He ſayeth the Apoſtle did eat the paſſover with *Chriſts warrand*, *yet it followeth not that we ought to do it*. *Anſ*. There is no paritie between theſe two practiſes; will he ſay that ever the eating of the paſſover was impoſed upon the Gentiles as they did Baptiſm, as a neceſſarie conſequent of their embracing of Chriſtianity, as the whole Tenor of the Acts of the Apoſtles declareth? 2. The Paſſover was a Legal Cuſtom introduced many hundreds of Years before, whereas Baptiſm was but in its verie riſe and beginning,

2. He ſayeth, *that though it be joyned with Diſcipline, as Circumciſion was joyned with it among the Jews, it will no more follow that* Baptiſm, *is to be continued, then that Circumciſion is to be continued.* Anſ: that the Baptiſm here ſpoken of, is to be continued, I think himſelf will not deny. We ſpeak now of the inſtitution of an ordinance given to the Chriſtian Church. Therefore this his conſequence of Circumciſion is vain, and without the leaſt appearance of Reaſon.

Laſtly this Reaſon is wholly non-ſenſe, for none can perceive what it levelleth at.

3. He denyeth that the Apoſtles conſtant practice can declare, that Baptiſm with water is the meaning of the Command. *For,* ſayeth he, *the practice and teſtimony of the Apoſtle* Paul *declareth this to be falſe.* Anſ: 1. That this which he ſayeth of the Apoſtle is falſe, we have proved above. 2. All things practiſed by the Apoſtle muſt be reduced to three ſorts, either commanded, permitted, or ſimply ſinful. This laſt *I* think they will not ſay their practice of Baptiſm was, neither do they ſay it, but only that it was an indifferent Jewiſh Rite, permitted for the time, as Circumciſion, or the like. But this is falſe. For either ſuch Rites were not at all impoſed on the Gentiles, Or if they were, they were after abrogated. As for example, abſtinence from blood, and things ſtrangled, enjoyned *Act* 15. This I ſay was again abrogat 1 *Cor:* 10. and in the Epiſtles to the *Gal.* and *Tim.* (2.) That it is not an indifferent Jewiſh Rite, clearly appeareth from this, that the

reaſon why they impoſe Jewiſh Rites upon any Chriſtian, whether Jew or Gentile, was to bear with the Jews for a time, and to condeſcend to their weakneſs. But the condition of baptiſm, was ſtill their embracing of Chriſt; and the ground of it, their receiving of them into the Church. In a word Condeſcenſion to the Jews weakneſs, is in Scripture ever holden forth to be the ground of the impoſition of Legal Rites upon Chriſtians. So that there is mention made of this ground for every particular Rite impoſed; but this condeſcenſion is never ſaid to be the ground of impoſing Baptiſm, but a quite other ground given, which we named already. 3. *If* this had been a thing only permitted for a time, and to be abrogat afterwards, then either the *A*poſtles unrepealed practice, which they exerciſed toward all Chriſtians indifferently, and that as ſuch were not ſufficient to walk by: Or elſe this was abrogat afterward, but the laſt they cannot ſhew from Scripture? Therefore it is falſe, and the firſt abſurd. From all which it followeth, that this was a Commanded practice. *And I* deſire any man of Reaſon, to Judge whether all the *A*poſtles perpetual unrepealed practice, or theſe mens naked aſſertions, be the beſt Commentarie on this place. 4. He denyeth that the word Baptiſm, as we expone it, is taken in its proper ſignification, and ſayeth, *that it is not neceſſarie to take it as we do, for Baptiſm with water, in ſo many places, as it muſt be taken for baptiſm with the ſpirit. Anſ.* This a meer aſſertion. In oppoſition to which I ſay, that he ſhall not be able to give one place of

Scripture, where this word is undoubtedly taken in their ſenſe; but *I* ſhall give him two, where the word is taken in the ſenſe, which here we plead for, and that undoubtedly. *A*nd ſo there is a double impropri[e]tie in the *Quakers* expoſition of the word, firſt againſt the Grammatical, and 2. the Scriptural propriety. We expect therefore according to his own *Poſtulatum*, that he will give ſome more weighty reaſons the next time of this explication.

Next I reaſon thus. To Baptiſe with the Spirit is not in all the Scripture applyed to Men; Therefore it is not ſafe without verie ſolid reaſons, to expone it ſo here.

*A*gain, all that they underſtand by this Spiritual Baptiſm, is ſufficiently expreſſed in the context. Er. There is no neceſſity to flee to this ſtrange expoſition.

*L*aſtly This expoſition is the product of the brain of Diabolick *Socinus*, as its firſt *A*uthor; which I think will make it be ſuſpected; and (ſeing it wants all ground) abhorred of all the Lovers of Chriſt Jeſus, ſeing this arch-enemy of his invented all the ſhifts and ſophiſtry, the Devil and he could, to deſtroy both the God-head of Chriſt, and all his Ordinances. His following words are anſwered above.

Next as for what he ſayeth in oppoſition to the 17. *Numb.* of this chap. in his 168 pag. it is ſo miſerable, that I only deſire the Reader to compare theſe two places together. Whereas he inſinuateth in this page, that P*eter* Commanded ex-

preſſly

preſly the Gentiles to be circumciſed, which he buildeth upon *Gal.* 2, 12. is moſt falſe. For the reaſon why *Paul* reproved him, was his diſſimulation mentioned in that chapter, and no expreſſe Command, if he will give us Leave to expone Scripture by Scripture. He ſayeth, as if *Mr. Brown* had denyed it, that *Joſephus* writ before the 200 Year of Chriſt. Whereas he ſayeth, that the firſt which wrot the Jewiſh *Alcoran*, or *Miſanioth*, with a tendencie to deſtroy Chriſtianitie, was *Rabi Jehuda Hakkadoſh*, about the 200 year of Chriſt. *As* now the *Quakers* do.

SECTION II.

Concerning the Lords Supper.

IT is moſt notour, that as the *Quakers* deny Baptiſm, ſo they deny the Lords Supper. See his 13 propoſition, with his *Apology* annexed thereto, where he maketh this only to be a Legal Inſtitution.

It will be needleſs for me to take Notice of what he ſayeth *pag* 170. *viz. That his Adverſary pag* 489, *maketh a Preaching to the* Devil, whereas he only inferreth from their Doctrine of Univerſal Salvation to every Creature, that they may preach to the *Devil* according to their own Principles. Hence we may learn how impudent theſe men are! Juſt as if becauſe *Robert Barclay* had challenged a man of murder; he that is challenged, ſhould conclude that *Robert Barclay* called himſelf a Murderer. As falſe, though not ſo ridiculous, is that, of which he challengeth one Preaching near *Lawther*, viz. that *he prayed to the Devil.* But he dare not name the man who did it, neither theſe who heard it; Therefore let him bear the juſt cenſure of a Calumniator (to ſay no more) until he name the man, and prove it.

When he cometh to the matter it ſelf, he is as weak, as before he was wicked. For in ſtead of preſſing his Argument againſt the Lords Supper, viz. *That if there were a relation between the Body, and Blood of Chriſt, and the Bread, and Wine in the Sacrament, then it would either flow from the nature of the thing, or the Command.* And while his Adverſary denyeth, that an inſtitution, and promiſe is all one with a Command. All his probation is his meer aſſertion, that they are in all reſpects one, neglecting the reaſon that his Adverſary gave for his denyal. But why ſhould I take notice of ſuch a ſhameful Vindication, wanting the very ſhew and appearance of reaſon. To the reſt of his 11 *paragraph*, in which by many weighty Arguments, this duty is proved from 1 *Cor.* 11. he ſayeth only, *that he ſpeaketh not to the purpoſe*, without ſo much as attempting to wipe off his reaſons.

He cometh to anſwer his 12 number, and firſt ſayeth, *that the Bleſſing, and Eating, ſpoken of Mat: 14, 19. will as much prove a Sacrament, as theſe places of the Goſpel, and the Epiſtle to the Corinthians*

thians ordinarly brought, can do it. But his Adverſary never inferred any thing of this kind, from ſimple bleſſing: But from other things conſidered with bleſſing, ſuch as, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, and the unrepealed Command and Inſtitution 1 *Cor.* 11, and the like. In Oppoſition to which, he ſcarcely giveth ſo much as a ſhift, and far leſs any ſolid reaſon. But we muſt excuſe him, ſeing he doth as well as he can. His next words are a meer Compend of what he ſaid againſt our meaning of 1 *Cor*: 11. in his *Apology*, without ſo much as attempting to anſwer his Adverſaries 14. Num: to which I referr the Reader. He ſayeth indeed, which is as good as nothing *that the Inſtitution of the Sacrament,* 1 *Cor.* 11. *was a Permiſſion; and therefore the practiſe thereof was not will-worſhip.* But upon the ſame account he may elude any Command in Scripture. For that there was a Command for this practice, he granteth; and that the Apoſtle correcteth the abuſe of this practice, he granteth alſo, without ſo much as mentioning its indifferency. Neither can he ſhew in all the Scripture, where this Command was abrogat, or the practice prohibited, as other things indifferent were. What *Titanian* boldneſs muſt this then be, to ſay this was by meer Permiſſion!

In Oppoſition to his 16 Num: where his Adverſary ſheweth the diſparity, between Chriſts teaching his Apoſtles Humility, by his Example of waſhing their feet, and his Command and Inſtitution of this Ordinance, he ſayeth meer nothing, but calleth him a Pope.

In Oppoſition to Num 17. he ſayeth he ſhould prove from Scripture, how they are ſafe in practiſing the one part (ridiculouſly calling the whole Duty one part) and not the other (meaning the occaſional Circumſtances of time, and place, and the number of twelve, and the like, which he as fooliſhly calleth another part of the Inſtitution) But his Adverſary ſheweth from many places of Scripture in the forecited Num: ſuch as *Act:* 26: 7. 1 *Cor.* 11, 18. and 20. That theſe Circumſtances are not to be obſerved, but left indifferent. But this man ſtill intendeth to cheat his Reader, by paſſing over the Marrow of what his Adverſary ſayeth.

What he ſayeth in Oppoſition to N: 18, Is a meer denyal that *Act* 2, 42, is meaned of the Lords Supper, without ſo much as the leaſt attempt, to anſwer his reaſons, or to Vindicat what he himſelf ſaid in his *Apology*, in oppoſition to our meaning of this place, Neither is he more happy in anſwering his 19 Num: where he proved that in *Act.* 20. 7. Is underſtood publick and Sacramental Eating. For he, according to his Cuſtom, ſlighteth his reaſon; as the Comparer may ſee (what he ſayeth in oppoſition to the follwing number. is of the ſame Nature. *viz.* meer Aſſertions, falſe Suppoſitions, ſuch as, *that the Corinthians were ſuperſtitious, in that they at all practiſed this Duty of the Lords Supper.* Yet one thing I wlll take notice of, *viz.* how he vindicateth his Anſwer given to that argument, drawn from 1 *Cor.* 11, 26. *Ye ſhew forth the Lords death till he come.*

Which is, *That by Chriſts coming*, *is underſtood his inward, Spiritual coming.* Which anſwer his Adverſary ſo happily impugneth, that he on the matter ſayeth nothing, except ye will call this ſomething, viz. *That Babes in Chriſt may have theſe indulged unto them*: But his Anſwer ſtill cutteth off Babes with the reſt, ſeing to them Chriſt is come in the Spirit already. But it is needleſs at all to Impugn this diſtinction, its own groundleſneſs ſufficiently doth it.

He cometh next to anſwer his 21 and 22 Num: and there he aſſerteth, “ That that which the “ Chriſtians were enjoyned to Obſerve, *Act*, 15,29. “ was no part of the Ceremonial Law, but an A“ poſtolick Command “ and thinketh that whatever can plead for the abrogation of this Injunction, will alſo plead for the abrogation of the Lords Supper. But taketh no notice, that his Antagoniſt ſhewed that there is no little Vanity, and impiety in his adducing *Rom.* 14. 17. *Col.* 2. 16. To prove this; and therefore he ſhamefully paſſeth over what he ſayeth on theſe places, and ſo giveth up this his *Socinian* Cauſe. For he that is a *Socinian* in this point, he doeth not deny, he ſayeth, “ That this Command ſeing it was given after the “ out-pouring of the Spirit, hath as much of a Goſpel “ Inſtitution, as any thing commanded before by “ Chriſt can have. Anſ. Well then I ſee, we will be no more troubled with quaking preachers, ſeing this Command *Act.* 15. according to himſelf is repealed, and yet hath as much of a Goſpel Inſtitution, as preaching hath *Matth.* 10. and certainly ly it will as well follow from Col. 2. 20, that preaching of the Goſpel is abrogat, and not allowed now by Chriſt, as from v 16, and *Rom.* 14, 17. that the Lords Supper is now abrogat, and not allowed by Chriſt. Now, let both old and new *Socinians* (I mean the *Quakers*) try to infringe this if they can. And I ſhall ſtill infer the one upon as good ground, as they can do the other. Which Conſideration, and Parity of places deſtroyeth this *Socinian* Conceit, ſay what they will in its defence.

AN APPENDIX.

IN which the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, *and in ſpecial of the Reverend aſſembly at Weſtminſter, in their Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 3. *deduced from the Ninth chap: to the* Romans *defended, and the Text Vindicated from the Corrupt Gloſſes and Depravations of William* Parker, *and his pretended examination of the Weſtminſter Confeſſion, which* Robert Barclay *hath made his own by referring us thereunto, as ſufficient ſolutions of all our arguments for our Doctrine of Election and* Reprobation, *deduced from that place.*

AMongſt the many and damnable Errors which the Quakers have raiſed out of their Graves, that of their denying Eternal Election, or at beſt making it whollie conditionall, uncertain, and depending upon the will of the Creature, ſo that notwithſtanding the Decree of God to the contrary, it might ſo have fallen out, that none ſhould have been ſaved, is not the leaſt: In which they conſpire with the groſſeſt of Pelagians, but the downright and moſt palpable contrariety of this their Doctrine of the holy Scriptures, which they ſometimes would fain ſeem to follow, hath made the more knowing among them to conceal ſo far as they are able, their thoughts anent the Doctrine of Election; Thus dealt *Robert Barclay*, who in all his Theſes and Apology, tho in his account *an entire* Syſtem *of* Religion, never delivereth his minde thereanent.

nent. And *Vindic. Sect. 6.* In defence of this non-ſuch Omiſſion, he ſayeth only, *that all do at times Confeſs, that it is not ſafe, nor proper too curiouſly to inquire into the Decrees of God*, which he proofleſly alledgeth his adverſary to have done: ‘and that it is only needful to ſay, God calleth ‘every Man every where to Repent, and be ſaved ‘through Faith in Jeſus Chriſt: Neither doth he any where directly *I*mpugn our Doctrine of Election; And yet he feircely falleth upon our Doctrine of Reprobation, and thus declareth to the World his ſelf-repugnancy, ſeing none can be ignorant, that our Doctrine of Reciprobation is Reprocally and inſeparably linked to that of Election. Moreover he thus publiſheth his Mind concerning Election, altho he by all Means endeavours to conceal it; for whoever denyeth Reprobation, by an Infallible Conſequence downright denyeth Election: And thus, Nill he, will he, we have his mind poſitively anent Election, and alſo Confeſſion intimated, that his Judgement about Election cannot abide to be tryed by the Scripture Bench. And yet *I* think few will ſay, That his Doctrine of poſitive and dounright denyal of Reprobation is much better founded; ſeing he with a *Pythagorical* ſilence, paſſeth over all his Adverſaries arguments, proving all our *Doctrine* thereanent. *chap.* 7. *num:* 10. 11. Theſe Arguments I ſay, about twenty in Number, he doth not ſo much as mention, and far leſs attempt a Solution thereof, altho he knew well enough, that except theſe be untyed, the whole frame of Quakeriſm is entirely diſſolved. But in ſtead of Reſolution of his adverſaries arguments, as he doth all along, he giveth the World a meer Contract of his Apologie, under the cheating Title of a *Vindication.* But when his adverſarie ſaith, *That the Quaker can no more Impugn our Doctrine, than he can Impugn what the Apoſtle ſaith, Rom.* 9, 19. The Quaker *Sect.* 6. *pag* 67. anſwereth two things; 1. That this is all one, as if a Quaker ſhould ſay, *confute all the Scripture which contain our Doctrine, and therefore diſpute no more, untill Thou firſt do that.* But the Man is good, where there is little to do: But if he had not intended to play the ſhifter, he had condeſcended upon ſome particular place, as his adverſarie did, otherwiſe he no leſs declareth his own fear than *Darius* did, when he objected to his purſuing Enemie, That he could not be ſubdued, becauſe of the ſpacious Countries, thorow which it behoved Him to follow him. 2. He referreth his Antagoniſt to the Examination of the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion*, *chap*: 3. Where ſaith he, *he may have his miſapprehenſions corrected.* But How cometh it to paſs that the Quaker hath taken no notice of many Authors, as *Twiſs, Rutherford, Dickſon*, to whom his Adverſarie in this very point did refer him. 2. But his care is not very great of Commutative Juſtice.

Notwithſtanding of which, *Ex abundanti* we will make a particular and impartial enquirie into all that he bringeth againſt the meaning of the Reformed Churches upon that place. The *Author* is an Enthuſiaſtical *Arminian*, called *William Parker* who is the Man I believe the Quaker underſtandeth; for beſide him I know no other particular examinator of this Confeſſion.

Now becauſe our Quaker placeth ſo firm confidence in this *Author*, that he thought a ſimple reference unto him ſufficiently doth his buſineſs. I had a great deſire to know what he could ſay againſt our meaning of this place: Which place appeared to me to hold forth our Doctrine, as clearly as the ſun-light: Having therefore made diligent ſearch, at length I found the book, in which *Chap:* 3. He undertaketh a particular diſcuſſion of all the *Arguments* brought from this place, for our Doctrine concerning Election and Reprobation, which how he hath done, comes now to be weighed. And 1. From Verſ. 6. He frameth to himſelf an Objection, 'that becauſe it is ſaid, that they 'are not all Iſrael, that are of *Iſrael*, therefore it 'ſeems, that all are not elected; To which he 'anſwers, that the *Apoſtle* intimats, that the Carnal *Iſrael*, or all that are come of Jacob, ſurnamed Iſrael, are not the *Iſrael*, to whom the promiſes of Salvation are abſolutly and finally made, 'tho in general the conditional promiſes belong 'to all *Iſrael*, as the *Apoſtle* ſhews verſ. 4. That 'we may not be miſunderſtood, know, that among 'others, there are ſeven promiſes made to the overcomers, Rev. 2 & 3: Chap. and ſuch as perſevere in the Chriſtian Race, unto the end, or to 'the death and burial of ſin. Now theſe and the 'like promiſes belong unto the Elect, that are

‘choſen out of the furnace of affliction. *Iſa.* 48.
‘10. Which with Paul have fought the good fight
‘of Faith. 2 Tim: 4: 7, 8: *And* ſo may fullie ex-
‘pect the reward, becauſe God is faithful that hath
‘promiſed it. Heb: 6, 12: and 10: 36. James 1. 12.

I Reply, this Commentarie (I ſhall not ſay a comment) is founded upon ſome Scriptures violentlie detorted ; for none of them doth in the leaſt inſinuat, that theſe of whom they ſpeak were choſen to grace only, & not to glory (which groundleſs diſtinction was invented of old by the *Pelagians*, and condemned and refuted by the Orthodox, as is evident in the *Epiſtles* of *Proſper* , and *Hilarius Arelatenſis*) and tendeth to the overthrow of the Covenant of Redemption, and the promiſes of God the Father to Chriſt, viz. that he ſhould ſee his ſeed, and the travel of his ſoul. Iſa, 53. 10, 11. and many ſuch like, for if this Doctrine were true, it might ſo fall out, that none ſhould come to Glory; for according to it, the gift of perſeverance is beſtowed upon none, and ſo the Apoſtle's perſwaſion, that *None could ſeparate him from the Love of God, Rom:* 8. 35. Should have been vain and groundleſs. And the promiſe to cauſe the *Iſrael* of God to keep his Statutes and his Judgments, to do them, *Exi* 36, 27. Should be meer words of deceit ; theſe and ſix hundred beſide of ſuch abſurd blaſphemies are unſeparably linked to this Doctrine. As for the Scriptures cited by him, they hold forth a Character of ſuch as ſhall be ſaved, *viz.* That they do through grace overcome, love the Lord Jeſus, exerciſe Patience, Faith . and the like graces ;

but they do not at all hold forth, that theſe graces, and perſeverance therein are in Mans own power, ſo that he may reject or refuſe them, according to the inclinations of his own will, and that God doth not make Men irreſiſtibly, yet ſweetly of unwilling to become willing. All which this Neo-*Pelagian* through the Violence of torture makes theſe *S*criptures to ſpeak, but the verſe it ſelf doth ſufficiently refute this expoſition; for according to it, the word or promiſes of God, might be without any effect, ſeing it might fall out, that tho all were elected, none might be ſaved. Now ſeing this Expoſition cannot Stand, the other, which this *Arminian* would fain reject, of its own accord follows, *viz.* That not all, and every one is from all Eternitie elected, and choſen to *Salvation*, as the whole Scope and ſeries of this Chapter doth demonſtrate, as we ſhall evince, while we reply in particular to the Anſwers he makes to the objections, which he frames from this place.

2. He goeth on thus, Rom: 9. 7. ‘Neither be-
‘cauſe they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all
‘Children, but in Iſaac ſhall thy ſeed be called.
‘Where the Apoſtle alludeth to *Gen* 17. 18, 19,
‘20, 21. It may ſeem then, that only *Iſaac* and
‘not Iſmael was choſen. Anſ. *Iſaac* was choſen
‘alone to be the repreſentative ſeed of God, be-
‘ing a Type, firſt of Chriſt, in whom God hath
‘made his Covenant. 2. He being a ſeed born by
‘Sarah, repreſents Faith out of the promiſes, ra-
‘ther then by the Strength of Nature: So is

Figur

‘Figure of the Spiritual Seed of Abraham, which
‘are begotten or born by vertue of the promiſes.
‘For ſo the Apoſtle explains himſelf v. 8. That is,
‘they which are the Children of the *Fleſh* (of whom
‘Iſmael carried the Type) Theſe are not the Chil-
‘dren of God, but the Children of promiſe are
‘counted for the Seed: *As* for Iſmael, who was
‘begotten by the Strength of Nature, and accord-
‘ing to the Fleſh of Hagar, which repreſents the
‘the Law, *Gal*.4. 21,31: He figured forth theſe
‘which ſhould be ſaved, not by the grace of
‘the promiſes, but by the works of the *Law*, a
‘people, with whom God has not erected His
‘Covenant, that they ſhould be ſaved in that
‘way, but tho Iſmael carried the Figure of
‘ſuch, it was without any prejudice to his E-
‘ternal Election or Salvation: For *A*braham pray-
‘ing thus for him, Gen: 17. 18. O that Iſmael
‘might live before Thee, or in thy preſence. v: 20
‘As for Iſmael, I have heard thee. *H*is being ſuch
‘a Type, was no more prejudicial to Him, then
‘that *M*oſes and *A*aron were debarred entrance
‘into Ganaan (They therein being a Figure of
‘thoſe, that ſhould be ſhut out of Gods Kingdom
‘for unbelief) without any hazard to their own
‘Salvation, as hath been ſaid before.

In order to our Reply to this and the following Objections, we premit. 1. That this and the following Verſes of this Chapter, are brought in by the Apoſtle, as Arguments, to prove his Propoſition laid down, v. 6. viz. *That all are not Iſrael, that are of Iſrael*, therefore whatever floweth from theſe Verſes, as their immediate Conſequents, is the meaning of the ſixth Verſe. 2. That the convincing clearneſs of this place hath forced all to acknowledge, that the Apoſtle is here ſpeaking of Predeſtination of men, in order to their eternal eſtate, and not as to the things of this Life only, as *Bellarmin de Grat et Lib. Arb.* L. 2. C. 15. *Stapleton Ant*, *pag.* 526. And among the modern Lutherans, *Hunnius* upon the place in hand, *who confeſſeth that the Apoſtle digreſſeth into the large field of Predeſtination.* Yea *Arminius* himſelf, in his Analyſis of this Chapter, dareth not deny it, tho he fain would. Having premiſed theſe things, we come to his Anſwer, The Subſtance of which is, *That Iſmael* was not himſelf rejected of God, but only a Type of theſe that are not the Children of God, which we ſhal refute, by evincing theſe two Things. 1. That tho Iſmael be conſidered here as a Type only, this place gives good ground for the Doctrine of our Confeſſion of Faith, againſt which he here fighteth. 2. That Iſmael himſelf was not elected. As for the firſt of theſe Propoſitions, it is evident; For otherwiſe there ſhould be no Correſpondence betwixt the Type and the Antitype, and ſo a Type ſhould not be a Type. I prove it: If Iſmael was excluded from being counted the Seed of Abraham, only by the meer good pleaſure and abſolute Diſpenſation of God, and not conditionally, ſo that Iſmael himſelf could have cauſed it to come to paſs, that he ſhould have been counted the Legitimate Heir and Lawful begotten

gotten Son of Abraham, of whom the Church and Chriſt according to the Fleſh was to Spring, then there are ſome paſſed by in the Eternal Decree of God, and that abſolutely, to whom God from all Eternity determined to give no Saving Grace, but puniſh them for their ſins; But the Former is true, yea and ſo true, that (*I* am ſure) none acknowledging the Scriptures will deny it. The Major is no leſs clear, except (as we ſaid before) any ſhal be ſo abſurd, as to deny a Correſpondency or Analogy betwixt Type and Antitype, and ſo deny a Type to be a Type, for in this *I*ſmael was a Type, in that he was not reckoned to be the Seed of Abraham, and a Child of the Fleſh, not a Child of Promiſe, all which came to paſs by the abſolute Diſpenſation of God, and not conditionally, ſo that Iſmael might have brought to paſs, that he ſhould have been the Legittimate Heir and Seed of Abraham, and born by Vertue of a ſpecial Promiſe: Neither on the other hand was the Election of Iſaac unto theſe Priviledges, from which Iſmael was excluded, conditional, but by the abſolute Diſpenſation of God: For *I* think none will ſay, that Iſaac could have hindered himſelf to be born by Vertue of a ſpecial promiſe, and ſo counted the only Son, as we ſee he is called Gen. 22. 2. Therefore, if there be any Correſpondence betwixt Type and Antitype, the Lord from all Eternity did paſs by ſome, that is, decreed that he would not give them Grace, but permit them to remain Children of the Fleſh, whom he did not give unto Chriſt Jeſus, to be his Seed by Vertue of the Promiſes of the Covenant of Redemption;

We come now to the ſecond Propoſition viz. *That Iſmael himſelf was not Elected*, This by any thing we can learn from Scripture, is moſt evident. For 1. He was by Gods own Command thruſt out of the Church, Gen. 21. 12. And that upon the Account of his perſecuting the Heir of Promiſe, and the Church and Image of God in him, Gen. 21. 9. Gal. 4. 29. Now in Scripture we find no mention made of his Repentance, or Re-admiſſion into the Church: Hence there is no Ground of Charity concerning his Salvation. 2. We find nothing that Iſmael exerciſed all his Life, except Robbery and Blood-ſhed, as appears from Gen. 16. 12. and 20 v. Which Leſſons the *Saracens* his Poſterity have exactly learned from him. As for Gen. 17. 18, 20. It ſpeaks of nothing leſſe than the Salvation of Iſmael: for as it appears from verſes 19. 20. compared together, the *Lord* clearly intimates, that he will neither eſtabliſh his Covenant with himſelf, nor with his Seed, and clearly aſſerts, that the things in which he heard Abraham for his ſon Iſmael, was only theſe pertaining to this Life: From all which it is clear, that Iſmael lived and died without Grace, or ſpecial Favour of God, and therefore was no Elect Veſſel; for I believe that none will deny, that the making out by Scripture, that Iſmael lived without the Special Favour of God, will abundantly clear this place from all the miſt, whereby our Adverſaries endeavour to darken it; That which he ſayes of *Moſes and Aaron, their* *being Types of theſe who were to be excluded from Gods ſpiritual reſt, who notwithſtanding were godly themſelves,* is ſo far from ſaying any thing to the Purpoſe, that I am certain he conſidered not what he was ſaying: For who did ever infer ſimply, becauſe he was a Type of thoſe that were paſſed by in Gods Eternal Decree, therefore he was paſſed by in it himſelf, we make no ſuch Inference, as may be ſeen from what we have already ſaid. I might here take notice of many other things, ſuch as his forming the Objection, ſo that he diſſimulates no ſmall part of the ſtrength thereof, not at all taking notice of the Analogy between the Type and Antitype, he knew to be urged not a little by our Divines, notwithſtanding that he himſelf aſſerteth Iſmael to be a Type, and ſo conſidered in this place, 2. I might take notice, that he clearly intimates, that there is now a poſſibility of Salvation by the Works of the Law and Strength of Nature. If it be Replyed, that he qualifieth what he ſaith by the following words, viz. *that God hath not made a Covenant that men ſhould be ſaved this way.* We return, That if his Principles ſtand, theſe words and the former muſt of Neceſſity compleat a Contradiction, for all theſe that were to be born (to uſe his own Words) by Vertue of the Promiſes, Iſaac repreſented them, but Iſmael repreſented not theſe, but others; now ſeing theſe repreſented by Iſmael, might be ſaved, as well as theſe repreſented by Iſaac, according to the Principles of the Univerſaliſts, it inevitably follows, that they muſt be ſaved by the Works of the Law.

His next Objection he gives in theſe Words together with his anſwer, is Rom. 9. 10,11. “ It is ſaid there is a Purpoſe of God, according to Election, not of Works, but of him that calleth.

“ Anſ. Altho Election there ſeems to import nothing but Gods Grace, as the Explanation following (not of Works, but of him that calleth) will in ſome ſort evict, yet we grant there is a Purpoſe of God, both according to Election of Perſons and Things, and that either General or Special, as hath been by us already often acknowledged, and the Eternal Election of Perſons in Mankind now fallen, whether General or Particular is out of Grace, and not by their own Works, wrought by the Strength of Nature, howbeit in that Special or Particular Election ariſing out of the ſpecial Foreknowledge of God ; Works of Grace and perſeverance therein are looked upon as Means and the way to Life, yea as a Condition, and a Motive both in that and the final Election of the Saints, which we call the Election out of the Furnace, Rev. 3. 4. Thou haſt a few Names in Sardis, which have not defiled their Garments, and they ſhal walk with me in white, Rev. 3, 8. Behold, I have ſet before thee an open door, and no man can ſhut it, for thou haſt a little Strength, and haſt kept my Word, and not denyed my Name. Read more at large, Rev. 7. 13, 14, 16, 17.

Reply, This anſwer, tho I will not ſay the beſt, is the rareſt that any man could have readily lighted on: for to aſſert the cauſe of Election to be Grace, and yet to be ſome ſtages behind good works, as he doth here, while he acknowledgeth Election to be of works, not wrought by the ſtrength of Nature, as ſaying ſomewhat more, then when he granted Election to be of Grace, is certainly ſo abſurd, that one can invent nothing more abſurd, tho he bend his wit to the very purpoſe, for then it were all one to ſay, that works done by the ſtrength of Nature are the cauſe of Election, and Grace is the cauſe of Election: or Election is of Grace, and Election is of works, done by the ſtrength of Nature were Equipollent. 2. That Election is Grace, or rather to ſpeak with the Apoſtle, *Rom* 11. 5. of Grace, is moſt certain, but he takes again his Confeſſion, and ſoon repents that he hath ſpoken the Truth, while he maketh Election to be of Works, tho not wrought by the ſtrength of Nature, and maketh theſe to be Motives moving God to Elect ſome rather than others, quite contrary to the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. 6. who makes a clear Oppoſition betwixt Grace, and Works, of whatſoever kind in the point of Election. But 3ly. He is yet more blaſphemous and abſurd, in that while the Apoſtle telleth us, that by theſe words, *but of him that calleth*, works in general, or without limitation are excluded, he will in ſpite of him, force this very ſame Phraſe to include Works. But 4ly. That the Apoſtle here excludeth all kind of Works from being the cauſe of Election, is clear from the Connection of the Words with what goeth before and followeth; for theſe words (*that the purpoſe of God &c.*) cite the conſequent of the Apoſtolick Enthymem, of which the words going before in this verſe, and the following is the Antecedent: which two propoſitions the particle (*that*) coupleth, obtaining the place of the Particle *therefore*; But this Antecedent, or the Apoſtle by it moſt carefully excludes all kind of Works, from being the cauſe of Gods preferring *Jacob* to *Eſau*, Therefore no kind of Works can be the cauſe, why God elected ſome, while he rejected others. Now it is to be obſerved, that even giving, and not granting, *Jacob* and *Eſau* to be conſidered here only as Types, that this our concluſion will well follow, ſeing without reſpect to their future Works, it was determined, That the younger ſhould have the Inheritance, Lordſhip and Dominion, and the elder contrary to the cuſtom of Humane Laws, only for the good pleaſure of God, was to be excluded from them. Now we ſay, ſeing there muſt be an Analogy betwixt Type and Antitype, of neceſſity ſome muſt be appointed to the heavenly Canaan, and Spiritual Dominion, without conſideration of their doing good, as the cauſe moving God to this Election: And ſome muſt be excluded from this Spiritual Canaan, Inheritance, and Dominion, without the conſideration of their evil deeds, as the cauſe moving thereunto; If any ſhould ſay, tho the Children had done neither good nor evil, yet the Lord foreſeeing the good deeds of the one, and the evil of the other, did ſo and ſo decree concerning them, they can ſay nothing more abſurd, and antiſcriptural; For 1. then there can be nothing made of theſe words, (*neither having yet done good or evil*) neither can any reaſon be ſhewed, why they were here caſt in by the Apoſtle. But 2. and more particularly, theſe words of neceſſity exclude ſome kind of works from being the cauſe of Election or Rejection; Ergo they exclude works of whatſoever kind, ſeing they exclude without limitation, the doing of good or evil, and ſo render that diſtinction of Works, done by the ſtrength of Nature, and by the help of Grace, of which he here talketh, altogether groundleſs; yea according to this diſtinction of his, one might ſay, that ſuch good works are here only excluded, which tho good as to the ſubſtance of the Action, yet are accompanied with no kind of ſincerity and ſingleneſs, but are intended directly for a ſinful end: But good works accompanied with any kind of ſincerity, and having no ſinful end directly intended, tho they be notwithſtanding wrought only by the ſtrength of Nature, are not excluded; I ſay, according to his diſtinction, this might be ſaid: For the Text affords a like ground for both; which aſſertion he that denyeth, is bound to give a ground for the one, more than for the other, from the Text. 3ly: The Apoſtles concluſion drawn from this Text, which is, as hath been ſhewed, his Antecedent, excluding works without limitation, from being the cauſe of Election, convinceth all theſe of contradicting the Scriptures, who will notwithſtanding pertinaciouſly aſſert, that only ſome kind of works is excluded. And now from what is ſaid, this his diſtinction of ſpecial and general, that is, certain and uncertain Election falls to the ground; For if the cauſe thereof be not works, but the grace and good-pleaſure of *God*, then no part of Election can be uncertain, except (*Obſtupeo, ſurguntque comæ, vox faucibus hæret*) they make the good pleaſure of God, that is, God himſelf changeable; and then all Election ſhall be uncertain, and ſo this diſtinction ſhall fall to the ground however. Behold, Reader, the blaſphemy and abſurdity, into which theſe univerſaliſts run themſelves; For Election, which is the cauſe of good works, they make to be the Effect of good works, and ſo ſomething which is eternal, to be the Effect of that which is in time, deſtroying all kind of order (This Argument *Auguſtin* uſeth againſt their *Doctrine*. De. Predeſt. Sanct. C. *16*) and proclaim real changes in the Father of lights, in whom is no variableneſs or ſhadow of turning; But why ſhould we tarry ſo long in refuting one, in whom is not to be perceived the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon, for what he ſaith, as the Reader may perceive. As for the Scriptures brought by him here, we have nothing to ſay, but only deny, that they make any thing for his vagrant Election, ſeing he doth not eſſay to infer any thing in its behalf from them, contented himſelf barely to act them, which when we have diligently conſidered, we cannot find the leaſt appearance of their Doctrine to flow from them; we ſhall therefore paſſe on to his enſuing Objection and anſwer.

Rom. *9*. 10, 11, 12. *For the Children not being yet born, it was ſaid, That the elder ſhall ſerve the younger, where* Jacob *and* Eſau *were diſpoſed before they were born.*

Anſ. 1. *It is granted, that all men may be ſo, yea are*

are ſo both for their temporal eſtates here, & eternal condition hereafter, but in a moſt wiſe and juſt way.

2: *We have ſhewed before that the Apoſtle relating to* Gen. 25. 23. *doth not ſpeak of the perſons of* Jacob *and* Eſau , *but of their ſeeds, The Nations of the* Edomites, *and the people of* Iſrael.

3. *It is not their eternal ſtate that is there ſpoken of, but their* Rank *and* Place *in this World. Now as it is lawful for the* Lord *to make ſome Governours and ſuperiours, and others Inferiours or Subjects ; So it was not any injuſtice in him, to make the Seed of* Jacob *the greater and ſuperiour Kingdom : For even the* Edomites *were appointed to a good and comfortable condition.*

4 *The Apoſtle makes this diſpoſal of them before hand, to prove that* Jacob *or* Iſrael's *preferment was of meer Grace, and ſo the Argument was apt for this Diſcourſe, and in that book where he aſſerts Gods grace againſt our own* Natural *Works and Merits.*

Laſtly, there is in this Subordination of Eſau *to* Jacob *a Spiritual Document, ſhewing, that the* Natural *or Earthly Man muſt be ſubject to the Spiritual and heavenly* Man, *for* Edom *ſignifies Earthly.*

Reply, It is well that after ſo long ſtruggling for a deſperate Cauſe, he conceds all at length : For if God hath diſpoſed of the Eternal Eſtate of every one, univerſal Election is a bottomleſs Fiction, except his Patrons affirm, That either all obtain Eternal Life, or elſe that matters fall out otherwiſe than God hath diſpoſed, and determined concerning them. 2ly. What ever he hath ſaid relating to *Gen.* 25. 23. For his Opinion before, we refuted it before, except he mean ſome other place beſide this, which he handleth this preſent Text. *viz.* R*om*. 9. 3ly. That their Eternal Eſtates are there ſpoken of is clear, ſeing the Apoſtle without the leaſt ſhadow of ambiguity, ſpeaks of the Children themſelves, and that the Election of the one, and the Rejection of the other, was antecedent to their doing good or evil. And that this is ſpoken of the Children themſelves in ſome reſpect, he himſelf here aſſerteth: Then I ſay, If this be true, their Eternal State muſt be here ſpoken of, ſeing the Lord loved the Perſon of *Jacob*, and hated the Perſon of *Eſau*, before they were born, or had done either good or evil: And that this Aſſertion may the more evidently appear (*viz.* *That God loved the Perſon of* Jacob, *and hated the* Perſon *of* Eſau, *even before they were born*, I ſhall more particularly vindicat *Mal.* 1. 2, 3. from his depravations, which follow in his next Objection, and Anſwer thereto: The firſt of which is, *That this place* Mal. 1. 2, 3. *cited here by the Apoſtle v.* 13. *to confirm that which he had ſaid concerning* Jacob *and* Eſau *in the former verſes, is not to be underſtood of their Perſons, but of their Seeds.* For then this place of *Malachi* ſhould be adduced by the Apoſtle to no purpoſe, ſeing he is here ſpeaking of the Perſon of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, which to ſay, is both blaſphemous and abſurd. Moreover, the Prophet *Malachi* clearly intimats, That he is ſpeaking of the Perſons of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, at leaſt that he is not ſpeaking of their Seeds, ſo as to exclude their Perſons, *Was not* Eſau Jacob'*s brother?* which Phraſe muſt be underſtood in the firſt place of *Jacob* & *Eſau* themſelves, and ſecondly of their Seeds: Neither is the reaſon of this *Arminian* of any weight, drawn from the words of the 3 verſe, *And hath laid his Mountain waſte*, to prove his point, yea, the very contrary follows from the words. *Thus I have hated* Eſau, *Therefore, I have laid his Mountain waſte*, for the Vaſtation of the *Idumean* Mountains is mentioned as the effect of divine hatred againſt the Perſon of *Eſau*, extending it ſelf in a ſecondary manner to his Poſterity: Even as the love of God to *Jacob* did extend it ſelf to his Poſterity, as is clear from *Deut.* 10. 15. with many other places of Scripture. Where it is evident, that the love of God did principally and chiefly terminat upon the perſon of *Jacob*, and ſecondarly on his Seed and oft-ſpring. Furthermore, our expoſition is clear from the very words of the Text it ſelf: For the good Condition or Freedom from Devaſtation, in which then the Jews were, is holden forth by the Prophet, to be an Effect of the Love of God to *Jacob*, extending it ſelf to his poſterity, even as the Deſtruction of the *Edomites* was an Effect of his hatred of God to *Eſau*. In a word, the good Condition of the *Iſraelites* hath the ſame kind of Relation to the love of God towards *Jacob*, which the Devaſtation of *Edom* hath to the hatred of God towards *Eſau*: But that the good Condition of the Children of *Iſrael*, was the Effect of the free love of God to *Jacob*, the Prophet there clearly intimateth, and as we ſaid before, many other places aſſert; Therefore the *Devaſtation* of *Edom*, was the Effect of the hatred of God to

Eſau, extending it ſelf to his wicked Poſterity: He ſayeth moreover, *That the cauſe why God hated Eſau's Poſterity at that time, is declared in the 4 v. In theſe words,* We are impoveriſhed, but will return &c. In which words, ſaith he, *Their Incorrigible wickedneſs is declared.* Reply, That *Edom* was an incorrigible wicked people is true, but nothing to his purpoſe: For in this their Reſolution, conſidered in it ſelf, of which Reſolution alone the Prophet ſpeaketh, and in repoſing themſelves in their own *Lands*, there can no wickedneſs be ſhewed. Hence we conclude with J*unius*, that noble Interpreter of Scripture, on the words, *That in this 4 v. is contained a Decument, that God is about to confirm* Iſrael, *now brought back from Captivity, to defend the* Land, *and to magnifie himſelf in all things; but on the other hand, that he was about to deprive the* Idumeans, *whom he had Reprobat, of all power to return or rebuild their Common wealth, tho they had endeavoured to do it.* Add to all this the body of Orthodox writers, both Ancient and Modern, approving our meaning of this place, we ſhall name two; But as *Gylippus* was to the *Lacædemonians*, they are accounted *in ſtare omnium*: The one is *Hierom* among the Ancients, upon the place, who ſaith, " He doth not only ſay, ' I loved J*acob* before he was born, but alſo I hated ' *Eſau* before he was brought forth; But I alſo have ' reſerved my love and hatred for their Poſterity. ' The other is *Luther*, *De ſervo Arbitrio*, Cap, 161, ' who ſayes It is not therefore the temerity of the ' *Idumeans* which is reproved, but the ingratitude

'of the Children of *Iſrael*, who ſee not what God
'beſtoweth upon them, and of what he depriveth
'their Brethren, the Idumites, for no other cauſe,
'but becauſe he loved the one, and hated the other.
In which place *Luther* largely demonſtrats, that the Prophet here ſpeaks of theſe things which he did to *Iſrael* and *Edom*, as the Effect of his eternal love and hatred, in oppoſition to *Eraſmus*, who by ſpecial Command of the Pope, did undertake the defence of the *Pelagian* Doctrine, in his *Diatribe de Libero Arbitrio*. Add to all theſe the Hiſtory of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, as a good Commentarie on both places, now in hand, which declareth that *Eſau* was a profane Perſon *Heb* 12. 16. and elſewhere, and that *Jacob* got grace, and ſo was ſaved, which is more than a demonſtration, that the Lord determined from all Eternity, to ſave the one, and paſſe by the other, which is the thing we plead for; That which he ſayes in the fourth place is true, but nothing to his purpoſe. Seing the Queſtion is, whether or not the Apoſtle in this place handleth the matter of Eternal Election and Reprobation: In the fifth place, he taketh the place of the old *Libertins*, who denyed that any godly man ought to be ſubject to any Magiſtrat, tho never ſo juſt, if he want true *Grace*; by reaſon of which Doctrines huge Confuſions were raiſed in *Germany*, as alſo by *Venner*, who with his Complices began to raiſe great Tumults in *England*, while he minded to make this Doctrine of our Author practicable,

He goeth on to deprave the 14. and 15. verſes; The ſubſtance of what he ſaith, we ſhall faithfully deliver in ſo far as he militats againſt our Confeſſion. Having inferred from theſe verſes by way of an Objection to himſelf, *That it ſeems there are ſome to whom God will not ſhew mercy.* He anſwers, *That the Apoſtle pre-occupies an Objection, which ſome might make out of the Continuance of Gods Mercy, ſtill to the Children of* Iſrael, *but withdrawn from* Edom, *as before ; What ſhall we ſay, is there unrighteouſneſs with God? Next that* Exod. 33, 19. *here cited by the Apoſtle, ſpeaks not of Gods firſt Grace, which he gives to all alike, but of the ſecond which he continueth to theſe that walk humbly, and anſwerably to the firſt, as* Moſes *had done.* To which I reply. 1. That he makes his Objection, pre-occupied by the Apoſtle, to be no Objection: For from the Lords continuance of his Mercy upon the Humble-walking under it, and his withdrawing the ſame from *Eſau*, upon the abuſe thereof, none could infer with any colour of reaſon, That there is unrighteouſneſs with God, ſeing the abuſe of good things deſerveth the Depravation thereof: And ſo according to him, the Apoſtle was triffling all the while. Again any that runneth not into willful prejudice, may ſee that the *A*poſtles objection hath more apparent Strength in the judgement of *Humane Reaſon*, by far than our *A*uthor maketh it to have ; for it is an inference drawn from what the *A*poſtle had ſaid in the former verſe, of the abſolute rejection of ſome, while others were Elected, which Doctrine carnal reaſon, as it doth yet, knew too well how to wreſt ; *A*nd from this Doctrine according to carnal Reaſon no little abſurdity ſeemed to follow: Wherefore the *A*poſtle appeals from its Tribunal to that of the Scriptures, yea even to ſuch a Text as ſpeaketh of the abſolute Dominion of God over the Creature. Yea the moſt abſolute imaginable. Now if the objection had been ſuch an one; as this *A*rminian profeſſeth it, there had been no neceſſity of the *A*poſtles betaking himſelf to this place of Scripture. 2. What he talketh here of his twofold grace, ſtands and falls with what he ſaid of his twofold Election, which diſtinction we have already rejected; for this Diſtinction of Grace in firſt and ſecond, it is groundleſs, for it is not in the leaſt inſinuated in this Text, *viz. Exod*: 33: 19. That *Moſes* had gotten in the beginning from God ſome kind of Grace, which had not the Divine power of God coming along therewith, cauſing *Moſes* irreſiſtibly, yet ſweetly walk in Gods *S*tatutes. But leaving him to uſe well, or abuſe the grace gotten. Now he muſt prove this from the Text, if he would conclude any thing from it; moreover, If *Moſes* ſpeak only of a ſecond grace here, which a firſt muſt in Faith and humble walking neceſſarily preceed, then this Text holds forth the Dominion of God to be no more abſolute over his Creatures, than that of a Magiſtrate towards his well or ill deſerving ſubjects, whom he ought to reward or puniſh, according to their deſert, and not to whom he will only: And ſo this Text ſhall deſtroy it ſelf. *Laſtly*, if the expoſition of this univerſaliſt were ſound, then the Apoſtles Concluſion, which he gathereth in the next verſe ſhould not follow, but rather the quite

Contrary thereof. For if God give a firſt grace to all, and that ſo ſufficient, that it lyes only in Mans will to come, or not to come unto God, and that Man hath power either to will or nill, at pleaſure, either to turn, or not to turn to God: and yet notwithſtanding, ſome come, and ſome come not, then all that makes the one to differ from the other, is certainly of him that willeth. The Anſwer of our Antagoniſt to this 16. verſe is rare viz. *Tho our Salvation be meer of Mercy, yet Man can both will and run in ſome ſort, as this Scripture imports*; becauſe he could have ſaid nothing leſs to to the purpoſe: For the Argument which may be framed from this verſe, and it is not of him that willeth, Ergo *Election*, or the purpoſe of God, (one of which words muſt of neceſſity be ſupplyed from verſe 11. Otherwiſe the Apoſtles words would want a coheſion, and the verb ἐςι which of neceſſity muſt be underſtood here, ſhall want a Noun) *is not* an effect of the will of Man, or of his good works moving God thereunto. Now this Argument is not touched by the anſwer, as is of it ſelf apparent: He therefore here delivereth up the cauſe, and endeavoureth to cheat his Reader. 2. This place imports no more a power in all men to will, or run in the way of Gods Commandments, than theſe words in Ezek. 36. 22, 32. *Not for your ſake*, and leave in all Men a power to merit at the hand of God. He goeth on to comment upon the 17. and 18. verſes. And 1. He deſires us, *To note that here the Lord doth not ſay, for this purpoſe I have created thee, but raiſed thee up* *or brought thee upon the* Stage. But this is the vaineſt of evaſions, for none but an Athieſt can deny, that God from all Eternitie did decree to raiſe up *Pharaoh* for that ſame end, for which in time he raiſed him up : and conſequently , that he decreed to create him for the ſame end, otherwiſe God failed of his firſt end, and was forced to betake himſelf to the next beſt: Which to affirm is to make God a Man, and ſo to profeſs atheiſm with open face ; yea this Doctrine bringeth the wiſdom of God below that of a Man, ſeing according to it the omniſcient God , did creat *Pharaoh* for an end, which he knew he was never to obtain. But 2. That *Pharaoh* was not only brought on the Stage , but alſo created to the end, that God might manifeſt His Power and Juſtice in His Deſtruction, is clear from Pro 16, 4. Where it is ſaid, that God made, wrought, formed, or created, for all theſe will the word *Pagnal* bear, all things for Himſelf, yea even the wicked , the Spirit of God holding forth, that this is a Paradox; unto the day of evil. 2. He ſayes, *That Pharaoh was known unto the Lord to be a proud and obſtinate* Re-*bell* , *as is evident* , Exod: 8. 2. But what he would hence inferr is not evident , except that *Pharaoh's* ill diſpoſed will was unconquerable by the grace and power of the omnipotent God: To repeat which Concluſion is more than to refute it. That which he ſayes in the third place, viz. *That God ſhewed Pharaoh the danger of diſobedience before he ſent his Plagues upon Him*: As alſo his fourth obſervation, viz. *that he makes him of un-*

willing willing to let his People *go* , *is meer nothing:* For himſelf here on the matter grants, That from Gods Exalting *Pharaoh* to the Throne of the Kingdom , He was deſtinat to deſtruction, and his day of grace gone, otherwiſe his firſt note upon this Text is nonſenſe: Therefore it follows, That all the warnings antecedent to the Plagues are not Declarations of the mind of God to ſave *Pharaoh*: And that his cauſing of him to let the people go , was no infuſion of grace in him. His 5. note viz. *That God did not harden Pharaohs heart, by infuſing any hardneſs into it , but rather uſed means to ſoften it , and bend his heart to obedience*, we imbrace withall our heart , as to the firſt part; for the ſecond part thereof, it is ambiguous; For if we underſtand theſe words of a real deſign in God to ſoften the heart of *Pharaoh* by theſe means, it is falſe , ſeing God himſelf declareth, *Exod:* 4. 21. Even before theſe were uſed toward *Pharaoh*, that he had no ſuch intent, but the contrarie thereof. He ſayes 6ly. *That the* Lord *deſtroyed him not, untill his heart byaſſed and willfully revolted from that inclination of letting Iſrael go, to which the Lord had brought and wrought him : So that the Lords pleaſure in hardening , muſt out of this example be underſtood of ſuch as are firſt or laſt refractory againſt his grace and gracious requiring Motions.* Reply , upon as good a ground he might aſſert, that Dives in hell had ſuch inclinations and workings of grace , together with power to uſe them aright , if he had pleaſed , which if he had improved aright , he might have paſſed

tho.

thorow the impenetrable gulf, to the place where *Lazarus* was. For Dives, Luk. 16. 27, 28. Had an inclination and a vehement deſire, that his five Brethren might ſhun the place of torment, in which he was: And ſurely this inclination and deſire was as good in it ſelf as *Pharaohs*, of letting *Iſrael* go; and ſurely the Motive that prompted *Pharaoh* to yield to the peoples departure, was not a whit better than the motive of this deſire in *Dives*, for both were acted by the fear of puniſhment: Hence let the Univerſaliſts be aſhamed of their firſt grace, ſeing it is common to theſe in Hell as well as to theſe in the World. 2. If this his Doctrine (viz. *that Pharaoh and every Man elſe had a ſufficient Meaſure of Grace given them, and power to uſe it well or ill at pleaſure, according to the good or ill improvement of which, they might have been ſaved or damned*) be true, and this *Arminians* expoſition of Exod: 9. 16. Here cited by the Apoſtle be to be received, then the Apoſtles Concluſion *verſ*, 16. is a meer *Non ſequitur*; for according to his expoſition, the Lord ſhould not have mercy on whom he will, and harden whom he will, but theſe only who will, or deſire to have Mercy, or to be hardned; ſeing this Univerſaliſtick Doctrine makes the main and Chief difference, betwixt theſe that are actually ſaved, and not ſaved, to flow from the will of Man, which they ſay has a power to receive or reject Grace, and ſo to be mollified, or hardned abſolutely, at pleaſure; now *I* ſay, to ſay this, and yet to aſſert that God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and hardneth whom he will, is no leſs ridiculouſlie contradictorie, than if one ſhould ſay that ſuch a judge had abſolute power over ſuch a guilty City, to ſave alive or put to Death all the Citizens at pleaſure, and yet in the mean while that there were ſuch and ſuch Conditions propoſed to this City, which they could imbrace or reſpect as they liſted, upon the performance of which Conditions, this judge could not, nor might not put to death any, nor ſave the rejectors thereof.

He goeth on to comment upon the 9. verſe. *Why doth he yet find fault? Who hath reſiſted his will! Thus, it ſeems then that his will in condemning the wicked is irreſiſtible. Anſwer, the will of God is manifold. Firſt voluntas Signi, that which he would have done by Men, and that may be reſiſted or diſſobeyed. 2ly. Voluntas* Beneplaciti, *that which he is pleaſed to effect, and that either abſolutly, to be done by himſelf alone, or with others, which cannot be withſtood; or conditionally in caſe the Creature act his part, this Conditional will may alſo be repugned; So that wicked Men can not excuſe themſelves by the irreſiſtibilitie of the firſt or laſt mentioned will of Gods irrevocable decree, at length paſt upon the obſtinat and incorrigible ſinner, which like his powerful and efficacious will, is inexpugnable: But it is the obdured Mans refractory and inflexible will, that hath now made this will or decree of God ſo peremptorie againſt him. So that God hath juſt cauſe to fault and blame the Man that periſheth, but not è Contra.*

Reply in the framing of his Objection, he ſhould have inferred that it ſeems that the Will of God, in paſſing by ſome, while he from all Eternity elected others to Glory, and of hardning them in time, is irreſiſtible, or unchangeable, for of theſe two the Apoſtle here ſpeaks: But let us come to his Anſwer, in which we may obſerve, that this diſtinction of *voluntas Beneplaciti*, in abſolute and conditionat, is a meer fiction, as appeareth even by the Teſtimony of *Arminius* himſelf, who in his Book againſt *Perkins*, acknowledgeth that *voluntas beneplaciti is without limitation efficacious*. But 2dly this Diſtinction of *voluntas Beneplaciti* in abſolute and conditionat, makes God as changeable as a man; for if the Lord have a real Will and Intention, that ſuch and ſuch things be done by ſome men, in order to obtaining ſuch and ſuch Priviledges, v. g. Eternal Life, then there can be nothing imagined, able to hinder the bringing to paſs of this deſire, but two things, *viz.* either the want of Power, or a real Change in the Will of God; but both thoſe are equally abſurd: neither let any ſay here, that this will of God is only conditionat in reſpect of the ends only, and not of the Means and Conditions thereof: For whoſoever willeth any thing, he willeth and deſireth all the Means and Conditions, in order to its bringing to paſs, and will give a Beeing to all thoſe Conditions, if it be in his Power, which Power none dare derogat from God. 3dly. This Objection, as this Arminian propones it, is no Objection, for in Subſtance it is this, If the Lord hath propoſed ſuch Conditions, as men can perform and ſo obtain Salvation, and yet obſtinatly refuſe them, ſo that at length the Lord after their rejection thereof, decreeth their Eternal Ruine, then he hath no Reaſon to find fault with Man, but the Blame thereof lieth upon himſelf. Now I ſay to propoſe the Objection thus, is to render the Apoſtle ridiculous, for there is no more appearance of Reaſon here, than a Subject ſhould have to grumble and repine, when he is puniſhed by his Prince, for denying Obedience to him, which to have performed was in his Power. 4ly. If the Objection had been of no more ſeeming ſtrength, than this Arminian or Pelagian (for all is one) alledgeth it to be, the Apoſtle had eaſily found out another Anſwer, than that which he doth in the following Verſes, where he ſtops the Mouth of the Objecter with the abſolute Power of God over the Creature, ſhewing that the Creature hath no more Reaſon to complain that God decreed, to paſs by ſome, and condemn them for their Iniquity, than the clay of the ſame lump hath to complain of the Potters Unjuſtice, becauſe he did not deſtinat it for as honourable an uſe, as another part of the ſame Maſs. In ſhort, if the Objection could be ſo framed, as that there could be an Anſwer thereto found out, ſuiting the Genius of Humane Reaſon (which is the Scope of our Author here, and all the reſt of his Brethren) then there ſhould be an indiſſolvable, and more than Gordian knot caſt to any that were perſwaded of the Divinity of the Scriptures, for conſidering the Apoſtles Anſwer in the following Verſe, they ſhould have but too much Ground, to ſuſpect moſt vehemently, that the Apoſtle was not aſſiſted with the *Divine* Spirit, who betook himſelf for Sanctuary to the abſolute Power of God, in the caſe wherein he , or any man elſe might have ſweetly ſatisfied Reaſon, and not thus ſtopt its mouth, by impoſing as it were an imperious ſilence, and left it far leſs quieted, than they found it ; That which he commenteth upon v. 20 is not a whit leſs vain than the reſt: the Subſtance of which is, " that the Apoſtle in this v. ſtops the 'Mouth of theſe, who complained, that God crea-' ted them with *Liberty* of will, and ſo with power ' of falling, to which ſaith he, it is anſwered, ' that this Faculty might be improved to the Sal-' vation of the Creature, as well as to the glory ' of Gods grace.

To which we Reply, that no ſuch Interpretation can be gathered from the Text, for the Objection propoſed in the former v, doth not in the leaſt intend, from the Liberty of Mans Will, to do Good or Evil, to conclude that Man is not guilty, but rather God. But from the Immutability and Irreſiſtibility of Gods Will and Decree of paſſing by and rejecting ſome, (as he did with Eſau) the Objecter endeavoureth to free Man from Guilt, and fix it upon God, neither is he a whit happier in taking up of the Apoſtles Anſwer; for the Apoſtle doth not flee to the *Liberty* of Mans will, that he may draw his Anſwer hence, but the abſolute Dominion of God over the Creature, and that hath propoſed ſuch Conditions, as men can perform and ſo obtain Salvation, and yet obſtinatly refuſe them,ſo that at length the Lord after their rejection thereof, decreeth their Eternal Ruine,then he hath no Reaſon to find fault with Man, but the Blame thereof lieth upon himſelf. Now I ſay to propoſe the Objection thus, is to render the Apoſtle ridiculous, for there is no more appearance of Reaſon here, than a Subject ſhould have to grumble and repine, when he is puniſhed by his Prince, for denying Obedience to him, which to have performed was in his Power. 4ly. If the Objection had been of no more ſeeming ſtrength, than this Arminian or Pelagian (for all is one) alledgeth it to be, the Apoſtle had eaſily found out another Anſwer, than that which he doth in the following Verſes, where he ſtops the Mouth of the Objecter with the abſolute Power of God over the Creature, ſhewing that the Creature hath no more Reaſon to complain that God decreed, to paſs by ſome, and condemn them for their Iniquity, than the clay of the ſame lump hath to complain of the Potters Unjuſtice, becauſe he did not deſtinat it for as honourable an uſe, as another part of the ſame Maſs. In ſhort, if the Objection could be ſo framed, as that there could be an Anſwer thereto found out, ſuiting the Genius of Humane Reaſon (which is the Scope of our Author here,and all the reſt of his Brethren) then there ſhould be an indiſſolvable,and more than Gordian knot caſt to any that were perſwaded of the Divinity of the Scriptures, for conſidering the Apoſtles Anſwer in the following Verſe, they ſhould have but too much Ground, to ſuſpect moſt vehemently, that the Apoſtle was not aſſiſted with the *Divine* Spirit, who betook himſelf for Sanctuary to the abſolute Power of God, in the caſe wherein he , or any man elſe might have ſweetly ſatisfied Reaſon, and not thus ſtopt its mouth, by impoſing as it were an imperious ſilence, and left it far leſs quieted, than they found it ; That which he commenteth upon v. 20 is not a whit leſs vain than the reſt: the Subſtance of which is, " that the Apoſtle in this v. ſtops the 'Mouth of theſe, who complained, that God crea- ' ted them with *Liberty* of will, and ſo with power ' of falling, to which ſaith he, it is anſwered, ' that this Faculty might be improved to the Sal- ' vation of the Creature, as well as to the glory ' of Gods grace.

To which we Reply, that no ſuch Interpretation can be gathered from the Text, for the Objection propoſed in the former v, doth not in the leaſt intend, from the Liberty of Mans Will, to do Good or Evil, to conclude that Man is not guilty, but rather God. But from the Immutability and Irreſiſtibility of Gods Will and Decree of paſſing by and rejecting ſome, (as he did with Eſau) the Objecter endeavoureth to free Man from Guilt, and fix it upon God, neither is he a whit happier in taking up of the Apoſtles Anſwer; for the Apoſtle doth not flee to the *Liberty* of Mans will, that he may draw his Anſwer hence, but the abſolute Dominion of God over the Creature, and that ſuch an one as he hath, who poſſeſſeth wood, Iron, Clay, or ſuch Materials, and is wilfull to make various Kinds of Inſtruments, which may ſerve either for honourable or diſhonourable uſes; but theſe Materials that are appointed by the Owner and Artiſt thereof, cannot be ſaid to be wronged by him, or to have any Ground of Complaint, and that by Reaſon of the abſolute Power, that the Owner and Artiſt hath over them; even as any of Mankind that from all Eternity are paſſed by and rejected of God, and deſtinat to Deſtruction for Gods own Glory, as it is ſaid Prov. 16. 4. have no Reaſon to complain. Now in this Analogy lies the Strength of the Apoſtles anſwer, which who ever denyes ſhal never be able to find the Senſe of this Text. Hence it appears (whether ignorantly or maliciouſly, I know not) that this Arminian hath come ſhort of uptaking either Objection or Anſwer; But moſt of all abſurd is what he ſayeth, in his Commentary (rather depravation) of the 21 v. viz. *That as the Potter makes no Veſſels of ſet Purpoſe to be broken, tho he makes ſome for diſhonourable uſes: So the Lord makes none of the Sons of men of Purpoſe to be deſtroyed, tho he makes ſome Superiours and Inferiours in the Church and Common-wealth;* I ſay this is moſt of all abſurd, for it is as clear as if written with a Sunbeam, that the Apoſtle is here ſpeaking nothing of high and low Degrees in Church or State, but of theſe who periſh, and theſe who are ſaved Eternally; according to this Explication, every one that is in low Degree ſhould be a Veſſel of Wrath, fitted for Deſtruction: [Seing none can deny, that this is all one with a Veſſel of Diſhonour: as alſo every one that is in high Degree in Church or State ſhould be a Veſſel of Mercy, aforetime prepared unto Glory, and one of Gods called Ones, as the Apoſtle was, (whoſe calling I think was effectual, and ſo certainly a Saint) ſuch a mark of Believers and Unbelievers was never heard before.

To Corroborat what he ſayes on this Verſe he gives us his notes on Jer. 18. 3, 4, 5. among which one is, *that the Lord expoſtulates with Iſrael for not ſuffering him to mould them a new.* To which we anſwer, that it will no more follow from this place, that the Heart of corrupt man is ſtronger in reſiſting than the Power of God, and that God cannot make men of unwilling to become willing, which is the meaning of our Adverſaries Words, than real ignorance of what was to come, may be concluded to be in God from Iſa. 5. 4. and 59. 16. Other notes he has upon this place, ſuch as, *That the Lord forms men a new by* Force *or Violence, but works with them as free Agents,* ſerving for nothing except to declare this Authors maliciouſneſſe; for he here inſinuates, that the Reformed Churches judge, that God deals with a ſinner in his Converſion, as if he were a Stone or a Bruit, the contrair of which appeareth from their Confeſſions, and in ſpecial in the Confeſſion, which he here impugneth. Ch. 10. 1.

He goeth on to comment upon the 22 verſe where he ſays, " That it is not ſo much as implyed, that ' theſe Veſſels of wrath, ſpoken of in this verſe, by ' the *A*poſtle, were fitted by the Lord to Deſtruction. Yea ſaith he, the contrary is imported, where ' the *A*poſtle ſayes, That God endureth them with ' much long ſuffering; For if God created them, or ' deſigned them of purpoſe to Deſtruction, things ' had ſucceeded according to his hearts deſire.

In Reply to theſe Cavils we find no difficulty; for God may be as well ſaid to fit men to Deſtruction, as he is ſaid to harden ſome. verſe 18. For I think none will deny, but hardening is a fitting to Deſtruction. 2. I think none dare deny, that even while God was hardening *Pharaohs* heart, he was exerciſing his long ſuffering patience, in permitting him to fulfill his courſe of ſin. *Auguſtin* de *Civit. Dei Lib.* 16. ſayes, ' God of the ſame Maſs, con- ' demned through Original ſin, did as a Potter ' make one to honour, and another to diſhonour: ' Our Author ſayeth moreover, That it is not ſaid, ' they were created, but fitted for Deſtruction *Καταρτισμενα*. Reply, Altho our Adverſary loves alwayes to paſs over the Connection of the verſes of this Chapter, as indeed he hath good reaſon to do, he notwithſtanding may permit us to conſider it: In which we ſhall find, that men may be ſaid to be fitted to wrath, even as ſome part of the lump of clay is fitted by the Potter, for Veſſels of Diſhonour: *B*ut it is appointed for this diſhonourable uſe as ſoon as it is appointed to be veſſels: But ſo it is, That the Lord ſo ordereth of men as the Potter of his Clay, as the Apoſtle here ſhewes. *It* is clear therefore, That by this word Fitted, muſt be underſtood among other things, Appointed or Decreed.

He goeth on to Comment on the 23 verſe, where among ſome other things, which he hath not to the Purpoſe that he intendeth, he aſſerts, *That this preparing of the Veſſels of Glory, is not attributed to Gods* Eternal Decree. And in this he is but like himſelf, who, as we have heard above denyeth on the matter, that there is any Decree of God concerning the Salvation or Damnation of men in particular before death: Altho at another time, as we have alſo heard, he ſticketh not to contradict this; But that this preparation is Attributed to the Decree of God, is clear, not only from the Scope of the Apoſtle, and the Energie of the word ϖροτοιμασεν but alſo from no few other Scriptures, ſuch as *Eph.* 1. 4, 5, 6, 7.

At length to ſhut up this Diſcourſe, Let the Reader Obſerve with me. 1. That tho men bring full Wain-loads of Arguments, in appearance like Goliah's Sword, from the Armorie of corrupt Reaſon, whereby to overthrow the genuine meaning of this place, they are not to be regarded, neither on this account are we to be moved or ſhaken, as touching the behalf of this place. For in ſo far as we are ſhaken from it through the force of theſe Reaſons, We yield to theſe great Adverſaries of Chriſt Jeſus, the *Socinians*, that grand Principle of all Orthodox Chriſtians *viz.* that Reaſon as well as the reſt of the Scriptures Rivals, ought to ſtrike ſail, and yeild preheminency thereto, as being the entire and ultimat Rule of the Faith and Manners of

a

a Chriſtian. This I have good reaſon to note here; For there be many that though they cannot but perceive this Text to be, without the higheſt violenting and detorting thereof, utterly incapable of any other ſenſe, than what the Reformed, and in eſpecial our Reverend *Weſtminiſter Aſſembly*, give upon it ſtill, notwithſtanding alledge, that on the account of their moſt powerful Reaſons to the contrary, This our meaning is not to be received, ſeek another where we will. 2. That if there be a Doctrine in all the Holy Scriptures, out of the reach of, and far above the Line of Humane Reaſon, contrary to Corrupt Reaſon, and in its Eſtimat repugnant to all Reaſon (as certainly there is) then no man will deny, but that this Doctrine of Eternal Election, and Reprobation, is one of the cheif of ſuch Doctrines, as having for its Object, that which is no leſs Imperveſtigable than Eternity, no leſs unfathomable than Immenſity, no leſs Incomprehenſible, than he whoſe very name is Wonderful, and ſo wonderful that none can know it, even God himſelf, according to his Eternal actings and workings. 3ly. That this place of Scripture, is one of the chief Seats of the Doctrine of Election and Reprobation: Hence we moſt rationally infer, that in agitation of this great Controverſy; If any *S*criptures be brought, which ſeemingly (for none do it really) ſpeak contrary to this Text, Light is to be brought from this place, for expounding and clearing up the meaning of theſe ſeemingly repugnant Scriptures, much rather, that ê *contra*, theſe ſhould be made the Standard and Guide in expoſition of this.

FINIS.

M

38837/